

"I Want Candy"

by Ed Sachs

A SAGA OF THE CHICAGO
POLICE AND THE DECENT
VERSUS THE GOOD PEOPLE

20

FOCUS
MIDWEST

64



*Two Bishops
In a Time
Of Change*

Joseph Cardinal Ritter

BY C. G. CONDON

Bishop Charles H. Helmsing

BY JAMES M. JOHNSON

OUT OF FOCUS

(Readers are invited to submit items for publication, indicating whether the sender can be identified. Items must be fully documented and not require any comment.)

The *Near North News*, Chicago weekly, editorialized on the coming trial of a young miss who appeared in a topless bathing suit on a Chicago beach: "... as responsible members of the community, should we be called for jury duty, we will not shirk our role as Americans and will render a just verdict after a careful examination of the unadorned facts of the case." Meanwhile Chicago Alderman Joseph T. Burke demanded approval of a measure adding a mandatory 10-day jail sentence to the city's indecent exposure ordinance. (Police Superintendent Wilson thinks present laws "cover" the situation.) Burke called it a "serious situation" and said he envisions "a lot of young maidens running around the beach with a lot of young men running after them and dashing them to the ground."

Pieter Byhouwer told the lifeguard that his son's nudity was not likely to upset Chicago but police were called and Byhouwer was arrested. He was charged with disorderly conduct for letting his one-year-old son (he will be two in August) romp nude on the beach.

From *Chicago Daily News*

Subhead in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* on a dispute at the Republican convention in Missouri between Rep. Thomas B. Curtis and Gerald A. Rimmel, chairman of the St. Louis County Council, read: "U.S. Representative Said to Have Slapped at Council Chairman in Altercation." The *Globe-Democrat* headlined their report: "Rimmel Lunges at Curtis in Dispute." . . . A resolution praising Senator Everett M. Dirksen (Rep.), Illinois, for his support and leadership in behalf of the civil rights bill was defeated at the Missouri convention.

Ethan K. McCabe a John Bircher, was arrested last July in Kirkwood, Missouri, where he and a companion, John Emery Blumer, planned to tear down a sign on the lawn of Eliot Unitarian Chapel, because it was "communistic." The sign said: "The Worst Sin Towards Our Fellow Creatures Is Not To Hate But To Be Indifferent to Them."

Submitted by George Alton, St. Louis

The *Medical Tribune* headlined an article based on a survey "Doctors Favor Goldwater; 71 per cent Choose Republicans." It showed that six categories favor Goldwater . . . except for psychiatrists who endorse President Johnson by 66.5 per cent with only 6.9 per cent for the Arizona senator. Internists and Pediatricians also give slight edges to Johnson.

Submitted by Walter Dale

Since 1895, when the D.A.R. received a charter granted by Congress, it has been getting its annual reports printed at government expense. Last year the 1,500 copies cost the government \$4,300.

From *March of Events* by Henry Cathcart, columnist in the *Chicago Daily Defender*

"You're freedom riders, aren't you? We don't want your kind here," Ray McKenney, YMCA desk clerk at Memphis, Tennessee told three students en route to Jackson, Mississippi.

"Your belief is your right," Circuit Judge Maupin Cummings told prospective Washington County, Arkansas, grand jurors, "but I don't want you as a jury member if you do not believe in God"

The "American Committee on Immigration Policy" has opened headquarters at 132 Third Street, S.E. Washington, D.C. to fight against any liberalization of immigration laws. Rear Admiral C. S. Stephenson, USN (Ret.) is chairman and Robert H. Goldsborough, a former staff investigator for the House Committee on un-American Activities serves as Stephenson's Executive Secretary. The main target of the new group is the Hart Bill (S. 747). The *Congressional Quarterly* meanwhile reports that the "American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc.," 1025 Connecticut ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. has registered with the federal government as a lobbyist "to support the present immigration and nationality act; and to oppose amendments thereto as follows: S 747, S 751, S 1641, S 1823, S 1932, and HR 7700."

COVER CREDITS

Joseph Cardinal Ritter is being interviewed by a television reporter in Rome during the Vatican Council. (Photo courtesy of the Catholic Reporter, Kansas City.)

Bishop Charles H. Helmsing exchanges views with Bishop Wells of the Episcopal Diocese at St. George's Episcopal Church, Kansas City. (Photo by Charles Brenneke and courtesy of the Catholic Reporter.)

FOCUS/Midwest, Volume 3, Number 3. Second class postage paid at St. Louis, Mo. Published monthly by FOCUS/Midwest Publishing Co., Inc. except for one combination issue for December and January. Subscription rates: \$6 one year, \$11 two years, \$15 three years, \$25 five years, \$100 lifetime. Foreign \$1.50 per year extra. Allow one month for address changes. Advertising rates upon request. Enclose stamped, self-addressed envelope with manuscript. April, 1964 copyright © 1964, by FOCUS/Midwest Publishing Company, Inc.

PUBLISHER and EDITOR/Charles L. Klotzer

LITERARY EDITOR/Webster Schott

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS/Harry Barnard, Tilghman R. Cloud, Irving Dilliard, Bernard Eismann, Robert Farnsworth, Robert G. Hoyt, Hubert H. Humphrey, Abner J. Mikva, S. K. Oberbeck, Harry Mark Petrakis, Dan Sauls, Paul Simon.

ART DIRECTOR/Peter Geist

DESIGNER/Chip Reay

ILLUSTRATOR/Gary Adamson

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

(Editorial Advisors are not responsible for the editorial policy of FOCUS/Midwest.)
ARTS/Claude Bentley, Fred Conway, John W. Downey, John A. Holabird, Kenneth E. Hudson, Herman Kogan, Sidney Lawrence, Harry Mintz, Harry T. Moore, Andrew W. Morgan, Henry Orland, Joseph R. Passoneau, Mark M. Perlberg, Siegfried G. Reinhardt, Laurence Siekman, Allen S. Weller; ECONOMICS and FINANCE/M. Mason Gaffney, Berndt L. Kolker, Albert Rees, Irwin Sobel, Paul Ullman Jr.; EDUCATION/Hayes Beall, Charles Benton, Alexander Calandra, John B. Ervin, John J. Hicks, Robert L. Payton, Edward W. Rosenheim, Jr., Miss Jennie Wahlert, George H. Watson, Otto Wirth; FEDERAL GOVERNMENT/Douglas B. Anderson, William N. Chambers, Charles W. Davis, Herman Finer, Robert E. Merriam, Jack W. Peltason; HEALTH and MEDICINE/H. T. Blumenthal, James Colbert, William H. Danforth, E. Frank Ellis, Arthur C. Falls, Samuel B. Guze, Russell Levy, Carl Moyer, Alfred S. Schwartz, Park J. White, Walter A. Younger; HUMAN RIGHTS/Mrs. Bernard Becker, Lucile H. Bluford, Virgil L. Border, Abraham G. Duker, Lorenzo J. Greene, Trafford P. Maher, S. J., Julius J. Nodel, Abbot Rosen, Myron Schwartz, Chester E. Stovall, Benjamin Weintraub, Kale Williams; LABOR and MANAGEMENT/Daniel Cantwell, Robert W. Fleming, Delmond Garst, Marc Karson, Sidney Lens, Martin Lieberman, Frank McCallister, John McCollum, Glenn L. Moller, Joel Seidman; LAW/Irving Achtenberg, Irl B. Baris, Eugene H. Buder, Arthur J. Freund, David M. Grant, Elmer Gertz, Harold C. Hanke, Louis A. Kohn, J. Norman McDonough, Anthony P. Nugent Jr., Robert E. Rosenwald; PHILOSOPHY and RELIGION/Raymond Bragg, Ned Cole, James Collins, Jerome W. Grollman, Lewis E. Hahn, Charles Hartman, J. F. Hornback, George P. Klubertanz, S. J., Albert William Levi, Allen O. Miller, Leslie T. Pennington, Tyler Thompson; PRESS, RADIO, and TV/Harry S. Ashmore, Carolyn Benton Cockefair, Carter Davidson, Paul Fisher, James L. C. Ford, Harold Hartogensis, Herbert M. Kraus, Leo A. Lerner, Wm. Bross Lloyd Jr., Curtis D. MacDougall, Martin E. Marty, William H. Peden, Lee Schooler; RESOURCES, CONSERVATION, and AGRICULTURE/William A. Albrecht, Leo A. Drey, Paul Greer, Leonard Hall, Charles E. Lively; SCIENCES/Barry Commoner, Edward U. Condon, Alexander S. Langsdorf, Florence Moog; SOCIAL WELFARE/Russell W. Ballard, Edwin Berry, M. Leo Bohanan, Howard B. Hollenbeck, William Kahn, Eliot Knauer, Robert H. MacRae, Clyde E. Murray, Edward Parsons, Lounneer Pemberton, James D. H. Reefer, Benjamin E. Youngdahl; STATE and LOCAL GOVERNMENT/F. Neil Aschemeyer, Leon M. Despres, Martin L. Faust, Richard Lockhart, Seymour Z. Mann, Ralph Mansfield, Carl A. McCandless, Anthony Scariano, Paul G. Steinbicker; URBAN and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/A. Theodore Brown, William H. Brueckner, David B. Carpenter, John Cordwell, Gene H. Graves, Robert J. Havighurst, Warren E. Peterson, Edward L. Ullman, Richard C. Wade.

OUT OF FOCUS	2
LETTERS	4
EDITORIALS	6

THE HOLY WAR/Hubert H. Humphrey	7
---------------------------------	---

DATELINES	7
CHICAGO/Harry Mark Petrakis	
ST. LOUIS/S. K. Oberbeck	
KANSAS CITY/Robert Farnsworth	

"I WANT CANDY!" /Ed Sachs	11
<i>A Saga Of Police And The Decent Versus The Good People</i>	-

ST. LOUIS TRANSPORTATION:	
A SHRINKING SUCCESS/Harriett Woods	14
<i>While Improved Service Cannot Be Expected Now, No Plans Are Made For Ultimate Solutions</i>	

TWO BISHOPS IN A TIME OF CHANGE	16
Joseph Cardinal Ritter/C. G. Condon	
Bishop Charles H. Helmsing/James M. Johnson	

ARE YOU A LIBERAL OR A CONSERVATIVE?	20
<i>A Revealing Study By Social Scientists</i>	

THE TROUBLE WITH LABOR/Walter P. Reuther	22
--	----

4TH OF JULY and GO READ THE RIVER	25
Poems by David Pearson Etter	

BOOK REVIEWS	25
THE "CHICAGO" SERIES/Harry T. Moore reviews "Artie and Pink Marsh" by George Ade, "The Bomb" by Frank Harris, and "Erik Dorn" by Ben Hecht	
RELIGION WITHOUT COMPETITION/James D. Collins reviews "Church Unity and Church Mission" by Martin E. Marty	

VOTING RECORDS	28
<i>Congress/Missouri and Illinois</i>	



Letters

On "Terror Over Mississippi"

F/M: I am aware that there is a certain amount of calculated brutality endemic in our penal system, but for a person to be deliberately punished for helping other citizens to use the rights guaranteed them by the basic law of the land, is far more un-American than anything so industriously investigated by H.U.A.C. I wonder if H.U.A.C. would be interested in investigating this aspect of Un-American activities? Probably not. The rights of these people must be protected.

Jim Gill
Kansas City, Mo.

"Dateline: St. Louis"

F/M: His appreciable talent notwithstanding and despite the charm of the engaging bit of literary trivia he crocheted under "Dateline St. Louis" in the last issue, columnist S. K. Oberbeck ill serves his publisher (and me, his reader, for that matter) by presuming to set down what he likes to write rather than what ought to be written.

In contrast to the informative half dozen items pertinent to Kansas City and its goings-on as written by Robert Farnsworth, the St. Louis column fails to answer my wish to see FOCUS/Midwest has to say about our city.

If columnist Oberbeck wants to indulge in abstractions and impressions of sea-shell collecting, let him. But get someone else to write a "Dateline St. Louis"!

Edgar Roberts
Kirkwood, Missouri

Conroy Unfair to Algren?

F/M: Jack Conroy's review of Edward Wagenknecht's *Chicago* (Vol. III, No. 1) made good, dispassionate sense until he got onto the subject of Nelson Algren. I have no idea what sort of personal gripe Conroy has against Chicago's finest writer (nor am I particularly interested), but if he must wage this vendetta in your columns, surely he ought to avoid hitting below the belt. If Algren's publishers wish to photograph him

standing against a "grimy billboard" that's their privilege; but Algren himself should only be judged by the contents of his books — which unfailingly reveal him as one of the very few writers around who sincerely give a damn about "those below." If Algren wishes to hear some dixieland at Jazz Limited, why not? — but referring to that oversized bar as a "posh night club" in an attempt to (somehow) discredit Algren is absurd. And as for Algren discoursing on "poker playing" and "horse racing," well, I don't know where Conroy comes from, but out here in the Midwest we prefer both of those activities to six-handed backgammon and cricket.

R. R. Cuscaden
Harvey, Illinois

Mr. Conroy Replies: Mr. Cuscaden's protest seems to be based on the contention that comment on Chicago's "finest" writer should be limited to evaluation of his writings, and that attempting to separate the Algren of self-created legend from the Algren of somewhat less flamboyant actuality constitutes "hitting below the belt." The point I wished to make is that Professor Wagenknecht's dismay and indignation at Algren's denunciation of "you squares on top" are misapplied. Perhaps a fuller examination of the pronouncement from which Wagenknecht quoted will shed more light. It appeared in Harry Warfel's *American Novelists of Today*, in which Algren is credited with saying:

"I have almost no interest in the Literary Life as such. The only literary events I attend are under duress, and I sweat the whole time. Outside the great Russians, almost the only books I read are those undertaken for reviewing purposes. My politics tend to the left. But since they don't always tend directly and with a sufficiently unwavering faith, they have been found unacceptable to the orthodox left. My friends, therefore, are men and women who never go to literary occasions and who seldom read a book and have no politics other than the politics of how to stay out of jail. And the more I see of literary and politically developed people, the

deeper my trust becomes in those who have not had the opportunity for such development. In fact, the more I see of those below, the more I say to hell with you squares on top."

This self-conscious primitivism and studied anti-intellectualism suggest the attitudes of Ernest Hemingway, who has had a strong behavioristic influence on Algren — particularly since he has become an active laborer in the vineyard of what has aptly been called the "Hemingway industry." It is the same sort of posturing which once provoked Max Eastman to say: "Take that false hair off your chest, Ernest. We know who you really are."

Verily, the Old Town intelligentsia commune more with Algren than do the lumpenproletariat of Division Street. And if we are to judge from announcements of his appearances at seminars, writers' conferences, cocktail parties, and other manifestations of the "Literary Life as such," he must be perspiring quite freely these days.

As to Mr. Cuscaden's lowrating Jazz Limited as merely "an oversized bar," if he can do so at those prices and in that atmosphere, I must grant him that much latitude. But certainly it does afford a startling contrast to the Division Street dives in what legend identifies as authentic Algren country. My intention was not to "discredit" Algren by locating him in that milieu. It was simply to separate fable from fact, image from reality. As the TV show puts it, "Which is the *real* Nelson Algren?"

Unsigned Letters

(EDITOR'S NOTE: While we do not usually publish unsigned letters, we have assembled a few which we would like to share with our readers.)

F/M: . . . The best place for your old copies would be in the trash heap. You are not "liberal" at all. You are "reactionary." You want the U.S.A. to go back to monarchical forms.

F/M: . . . You must realize that you are either "Pink" or "Fellow Travel-

Continued on page 27



"SEE YOU TOMORROW"



"SEE YOU TONIGHT"

Men who value their time—on the job and at leisure—fly Ozark . . . the airline that measures the midwest in minutes. So check your travel plans . . . check Ozark's fast, frequent service between 56 cities in eleven states. Two minutes spent now on a call to Ozark or your travel agent can save you many valuable hours.



OZARK
A I R L I N E S



The Irrational Ascend

THE nomination of Senator Barry Goldwater has voided the political refuge of "independent voter." We have always been suspicious of the voter who reserves his final judgment of national candidates for the election booth. Too often "independence" is a weak excuse for ignorance. But this year the issues are only too clear.

In the past we have been provided with alternatives short of the divisive extremes of political saviors. Your political opponent agreed with you on *goals* but disputed your *means*. In the coming presidential election it is the goals which are in deadly confrontation. The Republican Party has not been caught by a conservative faction, but by an irrational element. It is meaningless to argue whether Senator Goldwater is or is not an extremist; his ascendancy has been made possible by them, he uses them, and they will dominate his campaign and entrench themselves for years.

The post-war era has seen a shift in social conflict. The confrontation of traditional liberal and conservative forces has given way to a battle between the healthy (the moderates or liberals) and the sick (the extremists or arch-conservatives). Whether it is fluoridation, civil rights, or other issues, the pattern is evident.

What are their respective markings? The liberal says "I don't know." He can learn. He searches and experiments. He is not predictable. He knows that situations relate to conditions. He accepts the inevitable complexity of life and adjusts. The arch-conservative has the answers. He yearns for simplicity and proposes solutions reflective of his inner yearnings not his environs. He refuses to learn, to accept change, and responds in predictable even pathological patterns. Ultimately, he withdraws or clashes with reality, thus destroying himself.

The article "Are You a Conservative or a Liberal?" in this issue was first published in *News Front*, a management magazine. It provides ample thought for the above indictment. The coming election will be a gigantic moral drama (hopefully not a tragedy) in which the rational Republican and Democrat will have to take a public stand against Senator Goldwater and his following.

Humphrey for Veep

OUR readers need no introduction to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and his qualifications. The same motivations which made us invite the Minnesota Senator — and not some other national political leader — to contribute a regular column to this magazine move us to endorse him for vice-president. In view of the fact that he is a contributor to *FOCUS/Midwest*, it should be said that we have neither cleared this statement with him nor asked his permission.

We would welcome Senator Humphrey's selection principally for two reasons: the pos-

sibility of succession and the articulation of issues in the coming campaign.

His record proves that he could be trusted with the presidency should the need arise. His ability and understanding measure up to the requirements of the highest office. He is also a campaigner of the first magnitude. Anyone who has ever heard him speak knows that he asks no quarter and gives none. His calm and logical appraisal of domestic and foreign problems would provide a clear alternative to the Goldwaterisms.

With Humphrey on the ticket the campaign would be sparked with enthusiasm and a measure of excitement.

Issues for Candidates

THE U.S. Government booklet "Converging Social Trends — Emerging Social Problems" places the socioeconomic status of Missouri barely ahead of that in Southern states and finds Illinois' trailing the top quarter.

Percentage-wise, Missouri has fallen behind 36 other states. More than 17 per cent of its people live in poverty, which means having a family income of below \$2000. Missouri has more unemployed than 24 other states; has more alcoholics than 43 other states; has fewer adults with four years of high school than 39 other states.

In Illinois 9 per cent live in poverty (13th place); the state has more unemployed than 14 other states; more alcoholics than 42 other states; fewer adults with four years of high school than 33 other states.

Both states — particularly Missouri — are in need of an inspiring and grand plan. So far the gubernatorial candidates have failed to rise above the commonplace.

Diversity in the Church

THE forthrightness with which Joseph Cardinal Ritter and Bishop Charles H. Helmsing urge the Catholic community to move into the forefront of social issues as told in this issue, deserves admiration. Even a cursory reading of the *St. Louis Review*, the *Catholic Reporter* in Kansas City, or *New City* in Chicago, reveals a progressive and enlightened view. Their policies are not necessarily embraced by their readers, but neither are those of other progressive religious publications. Simultaneously, one can find other Catholic publications of less distinction, some promoting nothing less than outright reactionary and rightist views. American Catholicism is not monolithic and this point needs stressing again and again among enlightened and liberal non-Catholics. For example, in at least two interviews Bishop Helmsing — among other Catholic leaders — has placed himself on the side of the Supreme Court in the prayer-in-school controversy. He has said that prayer should take place in the parochial school, the home, and the church — not in public schools. He has said that Bible reading — in the tradition of

the Protestant dominated schools of colonial days — is contrary to the idea of religious liberty in the United States. An opposing view is expressed by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen testifying in favor of prayer in schools. The beauty of these contradictory statements is the growing and welcome diversity within the Catholic Church.

Banned and Quoted

THE effectiveness of a magazine can be measured in several ways. The number of unsigned letters received, some of which are published in this issue, is one yardstick; the reprinting of articles is another. (To mention a few very recent laurels: Lowell Erickson's "Terror Over Mississippi" was republished by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Irving Dilliard's "Dissent on Academic Freedom" was republished in the business magazine *News Front*; and Richard Wade's "Collapse of Progressivism Among Midwest Republicans" was picked up by *ADA World*.)

More telling, we believe, are other incidents, such as the banning of our last — and probably all future — issues from the Barnes Hospital Gift Shop in St. Louis. (The shop is run independently, although its volunteer manager is the wife of a Barnes Hospital board member.) We were told in no uncertain terms that Harriett Woods' report "Kingshighway DeGaulle — the Barnes Hospital Controversy" would make the magazine unacceptable forever. Moreover, our contributors would be asked to reconsider their writing for us; and, finally, we were warned not to repeat any of this to a soul.

Earlier, a St. Louis druggist told us that he could not sell *FOCUS/Midwest* anymore. A number of regular clients had objected "particularly to the Kennedy Memorial Issue." He readily admitted that they are right wing extremists, but "what can I do?"

More casual incidents also point out the influence of *FOCUS/Midwest*. For example, Chicago Alderman Leon Despres was moved by our report "Religious Discrimination in Social Clubs" to speak up at the City Council and challenge the City's renewal of a ten-year contract with the Chicago Athletic Club for the rental of a vault because of the Club's alleged refusal to admit Jews and Negroes . . . and Mrs. Paul Boswell told us that our report on "The Church and Birth Control in Chicago" has provided valuable background information for television appearances and other presentations . . . we could go on.

Fair Housing

A move is afoot to place an Illinois Fair Housing Act on a referendum. Proponents of the referendum who expect to defeat the measure have been responsible for much misunderstanding. The following clarifying questions and answers have been excerpted from a pamphlet prepared by Illinois State Repre-

sentative Robert Marks and published by the Evanston Veterans Committee for Equal Rights.

THE OPPONENTS SAY that the proposed Illinois Fair Housing Act covers every owner of property and every owner should, therefore, sign the referendum petitions.

THE FACT IS that the proposed Act does not apply to individual home owners, to buildings with two apartments or to buildings with three apartments, one of which is occupied by the owner.

THEY SAY that the proposed Act will destroy property values and cause an exodus of whites from stable communities.

THE FACT IS that this is an acknowledged myth which gains no truth by repetition. It is a deliberate attempt to create fear — the same fear which gives rise to panic and the destruction of property values.

THEY SAY that the proposed Act will force property owners to rent to undesirables.

THE FACT IS that the proposed law forces no one to do anything! It prohibits discrimination in selling, renting or mortgage financing only where the sole reason for refusal to deal is race or religion.

THEY SAY that the proposed Act will harass well meaning landlords, real estate brokers and lending institutions by requiring them to defend costly law suits, because every prospective purchaser, tenant or borrower who is refused will allege a racial or religious basis for the refusal.

THE FACT IS that this claim has been debunked in every city and state having a Fair Housing law and by the experience under the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Act. The proposed Fair Housing Act emphasizes conciliation and not litigation, and only where the evidence of actual violation is clear, i.e. that race or religion was the sole basis for a refusal, and after all efforts to conciliate have failed, are legal proceedings started to preclude continuing violations.

THEY SAY that the procedures under the proposed Act will be shrouded in secrecy with the accused being subject to penalty with no knowledge of the facts or circumstances.

THE FACT IS that this is a deliberate misstatement of the law! The proposed Act provides that initial complaints are to be kept confidential until and unless investigation establishes that the facts warrant the filing of a formal complaint. This is done to protect those unjustifiably accused from unfair publicity if no formal complaint is ultimately filed.

THEY SAY that the proceedings under the proposed Act will be "star chamber" proceedings which deny due process of law to the accused.

THE FACT IS that the proposed Act guarantees to an accused all rights of due process of law including the right to file answer to the complaint, to be represented by counsel of his own choosing, to face and answer his accuser, to reply to the evidence and to offer evidence upon his own behalf.

THEY SAY that under the proposed Act an accused will be presumed guilty unless and until he can disprove the allegations of the accuser.

THE FACT IS that the proposed Act expressly places the burden of proof upon the accuser.

THEY SAY that the proposed Act will deprive the accused of his day in Court.

THE FACT IS that the proposed Act expressly provides that every accused against whom the Commission enters a cease and desist order may appeal that order to a Court.

THEY SAY that any violation of the proposed Act could result in severe penalties or imprisonment for the land owner.

THE FACT IS that the Commission under the Act may impose no penalty upon an accused. If a violation is proved after full and complete hearing, the Commission is empowered only to issue an order directing that the violation stop. If the violator then complies the matter ends there. If, and only if, the violator refuses to comply and continues his violation, the Commission may seek from the Court an order compelling compliance. At this point the penalty, if any, is determined.

THEY SAY that the proposed referendum is a fair and constitutional democratic procedure to "let the people decide" whether a Fair Housing law should be passed.

THE FACT IS that the referendum technique is an invalid, unfair, misleading device for those who, fearful or unwilling to make a direct attack upon the proposed Illinois Fair Housing Act, cloak their opposition in an apparent goodness which is in fact most evil. The proposed referendum would destroy the very basis of constitutional democracy. It is founded upon the undemocratic premise that the inalienable constitutional rights of a minority so firmly stated in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights are dependent upon and subject to grant or veto by the will of the majority. The basic and underlying concept of a constitutional democracy, is that inalienable rights of individuals are not dependent upon the consent of the majority and may not be destroyed at the will of the majority.



HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

THE HOLY WAR

THE 1964 Republican Convention is over. A majority of the delegates and the candidate they chose did more than turn their backs on their own tradition. That is merely interesting news. They decided to try to polarize the American political system in terms of dogmatic ideology. This is tragedy. All issues now are to be black or white. There is to be no accommodation of honest difference of opinion. There is to be no moderation of reason. Instead, there is to be what Moslems call a "jihad" — a holy war — and absolute commitment is demanded. The sacred text has been underlined: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

This evokes a host of images: John Wilkes Booth puts a bullet in the back of Lincoln's head and leaps to the stage exclaiming "Sic semper tyrannis" — thus ever with tyrants. Brutus, past friendship and collaboration notwithstanding, stabs Caesar to death in the name of patriotism. Socrates is sentenced to die with a cup of poisonous hemlock by judges claiming he subverted the youth of Athens.

The crimes on behalf of liberty, justice, or in the name of God, are legion. A righteous mob in Jerusalem shouts "Release unto us Barabbas" so that Jesus may be nailed to a cross.

Let us be clear where the issue lies. It is in finite men claiming to have absolute wisdom. It is in private license being substituted for public liberty. It is in men claiming more than to be seeking God, but rather in their claiming to *possess* Him. The Republican candidate has explicitly abandoned the two great restraints — humility and reason — upon reckless human will.

"Vengeance is mine saith the Lord" — reminds the Old Testament. Jesus, with more claim than others to divine insight still agonized at Gethsemane: "Nevertheless, not my will but Thine, be done." Judaism and Christianity alike, absorbed the profound Greek commitment to reason in approaching the Divine Law. By reason one could approximate, but never possess, the ultimate truths about justice and liberty. Moderation *was* the great

virtue. Extremism *was* the great vice. Even the stern and conscience-dominated Cromwell centuries later could admonish: "I pray thee brethren, by the bowels of Christ, take heed that ye may be wrong."

What is remarkable in the aftermath of this Republican Convention is not that the lessons of history can be forgotten. More appalling is that the "translations" offered suggest that the lessons were never learned, or that they will be bullheadedly, dogmatically, and blasphemously overthrown.


We hear that one should not condemn Birchites and Klansmen because they have the right to freedom of speech. But no one asks the defenders of extremism to condemn free speech. We ask them to render a judgment on the content of that speech.

Or we hear that "extremists" have as much right to organize as anyone else. Of course they do. What we want to know is, are they condoned in secrecy, in a philosophy that the end justifies the means, in a Communist-type of action through "fronts"? We ask in paraphrase of Castelli: "If liberty permits these things, what is there left for Communists to do?" We want to know whether or not extremist votes are solicited in agreement with their opinions, or in cynicism?

We are in for a rough campaign. Since extremists abandon reason, it is difficult to reason with them. One could more easily conduct a dialogue with the deaf. Nevertheless liberals, moderates, conservatives — Americans all — must do their best to reason. We do not always agree with one another in either policy or how to administer it. Being human and finite we never will. But we can work together and reason together. We can believe, with Abraham Lincoln, that there are "better angels of our nature" that can and will protect us from extremism and from the division of our common life by hatred.

We must campaign with the utmost of vigor in these terms and with the utmost of good will. In such terms we can trust that this flashback to our primitive past will be only a dream, a nightmare that will pass away.

Senator Humphrey's regular column appears exclusively in FOCUS/Midwest



DATELINES

HARRY MARK
PETRAKIS

CHICAGO



No matter how hard I try these days I cannot properly concentrate on literary matters. I keep leaving my typewriter to return to the newspapers and to television to watch the progress of the political campaigns. They contain a dreadful fascination more gripping than many artful novels.

The Republican National Convention has nominated Barry Goldwater. I remember some of my friends who have been saying confidently for months, "he hasn't got a chance." Even before San Francisco this became, "he can never beat Johnson in November."

When Goldwater voted against the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 on the grounds that he felt some parts of it were "unconstitutional" he severed himself from 80 per cent of the Republican congressmen, 83 per cent of the Republican senators, and 90 per cent of the Republican governors who considered the Civil Rights Act constitutional. This is without mentioning the Democrats at all. Despite the apocalyptic assertions of integrity, his vote suggests one of three things: Goldwater is the greatest constitutional authority to appear in America since the founders drew the document in 1787; or, a man totally insulated from the realities of life by an art of logic coherent only to his general staff and to himself; or, a political opportunist brazenly courting the white south and the great backlash of white resentment that Wallace of Alabama uncovered on his gleeful forays into the north.

But the case is not yet closed. Lee Oswald may now be safely buried, reassuringly explained away as a demented misfit with feelings of destruction against all of life, but there are elements of the will to destroy still rampant in us all. We too are obsessed with the frontier tradition that sees obstacles overcome, manhood reaffirmed, security assured by a "quick draw" and a "fast gun."

The sad truth is that from the cheerleaders of New Orleans to the burners and bombers of Mississippi to the hypocritical racial chess players of the north, we are not always a people willing to share what we have. In the midst of our bountiful larders and our hymn books, there exist dark veins of anger and dissatisfaction, arteries of anguish because we cannot control our destinies as our forefathers did, and a national confusion as to what we really want. We are proud of our democracy, would die to protect it for our children, and yet are quite willing to have other parents and their children carry this dream like the cross Christ carried up to Golgotha.


I think, for the moment, that these forces of despair have found a champion in Barry Goldwater. They include the John Birchers bent on mobilizing secret armies and the Ku Klux Klan under their soiled sheets, but this is only a fragment. The great majority are honest and earnest Americans yearning for the descent of another Prometheus to bring them fire, to light their way into a promised land beyond the scourge and storm of our contemporary world.

And if their deliverer is defeated in November, they will cry out with heavy hearts and add this betrayal to their anguish. They will brood and wait once more to be called to arms. Goldwater, marching for a second try, or another hero from the mythic heartland of America, square-jawed and clear-eyed, riding his winged chariot, and speaking out brashly and proudly, unafraid to assail the complexities of modern life, contemptuous of limited wars, atomic decisions, welfare programs, intellectuals, and iconoclasts.

The tragedy is that these good people forget that true Americans belong to more than a single country or continent. They belong to a kind of spirit which expresses the deepest yearning of men and women all over the world for dignity and for freedom.

If we betray them, we betray ourselves.

Volume III, Number 3



Local narcotics addicts who want to kick the drug habit are finding a new door open to them in the Midwest area. A group of St. Louisans last month founded an organization here called the Sponsors of Synanon. To aid in the treatment and recovery of drug addicts, the organization is the only one of its kind in the region.

Its name derives from the parent organization in Santa Monica, Calif., the Synanon House, a communal dwelling where former addicts help others still shooting junk and popping pills to withdraw and stay away from ruinous drugs. Synanon, now noted for its unique, no-nonsense approach to physical and mental addictive treatment, has received favorable national publicity and the endorsement of many government, court, and health officials.

Its methods are harsh and unrelenting, therefore rewarding to a majority of the addicts who volunteer themselves to its stern regime. The junkie's first ordeal, in this community where everyone knows his deepest anxieties and cleverest deceptions, is to kick his habit "cold turkey" in the Synanon living-room surrounded by other members. He is made to confront himself.

No one has taken him by the hand and led him to his bed like a sick child. No one congratulates him for coming. No one gives him "just a little to take the edge off."

Synanon administrators give realistic support and sympathy at the right time. They do not, however, claim any part of the addict's victory over his own habit. It is "his gig, cold turkey, for keeps."

What follows the rigors of withdrawal is usually work. Weekly seminars — synanons — take place in the living room and these are free-wheeling, hard-knocking talk sessions where members may take each other apart verbally, using the language that best fits their moods. The two cardinal rules: no violence and no drugs, including alcohol.

The object is self-revelation while the addict is trying to stay "clean." Self discovery and personality growth come hard, but are probable in a

community of shared interests and past histories. At first, the addict's sole object is to stay away from the filth with which he has filled his veins for so many years. Later, through introspective discussion and a free exchange of emotions, personality problems that probably led to addiction are unraveled.

From the four centers now operating (Santa Monica, San Diego, Nevada State Penitentiary, and Westport, Conn.), many members who have stayed clean for years have "graduated" to productive jobs in the outside community. Others proceed within Synanon ranks and may go on to staff new centers as they are established.

The St. Louis group raised funds to bring two such members, Zev Putterman and William Crawford, to St. Louis to tell the Synanon story. The Sponsors of Synanon was subsequently formed.

Police, court, medical, and education officials in St. Louis were impressed by the reduction in recidivism of the Synanon method. Recidivism in narcotics addicts is higher than any other delinquency handled by the police or the courts in the United States, something like 95 per cent. Realizing that treatment facilities here were appallingly insufficient, the group established the Sponsors of Synanon to raise funds to send local addicts to California centers, the belief being that treatment is more effective if an addict is removed from his immediate environment.

A St. Louis Synanon House is definitely planned by the sponsors. The center would be staffed, presumably, by men such as Putterman and Crawford, men who know the ropes — the tangled knots — of a junkie's losing fight to escape life.



THE Congress of Racial Equality held its annual national convention in Kansas City. The convention had many dramatic moments: Gene Young, a thirteen-year-old Negro boy from Jackson, Mississippi, being refused service in the Muelbach Hotel barber shop one minute after President Johnson signed the national Civil Rights Act into law (he was

served on the next day); the massive singing of freedom songs in the hotel lobby at eleven on a Friday evening to welcome the arrival of the mother of James Chaney, missing rights worker from Meridian, Mississippi, and to pay tribute to Mrs. Bruce Klunder, active CORE member and widow of the pastor crushed by a tractor in Cleveland; and the free wheeling, rousing ironic remarks of Dick Gregory at the final session.

There were also many important moments which were not so publicly dramatic: the intense debate over the expulsion of Julius Hobson, former Washington, D.C., CORE leader; the struggle to shape a new constitution which would help to give order to an organization barely able to keep track of its surging growth; and the various project reports which defined the major directions in which CORE as a national organization is moving.

But there was one moment which dwarfed all others for emotional intensity and perhaps finally even for national significance. It occurred when Dave Dennis reported on the Mississippi Project. Mr. Dennis has been working intensively with COFO out of Jackson, Mississippi. He has only recently recovered from pneumonia, and CORE leaders have been urging him to take some relief from the terrible pressures of working in Mississippi for the last two years. He obviously suffers from the intense physical and emotional strain. Nevertheless he tried to give a factual, objective report on what was going on in Mississippi, but as he tried to explain how strangely irrelevant the business of the convention seemed to the needs of the movement in Mississippi where people were being beaten and even murdered, he broke down and cried. There was a massive surge of shame and sympathy. The audience stood and applauded while Mr. Dennis recovered and finished his report.

There immediately was a rash of motions and statements from the floor trying to channel the intense feeling of the convention into some kind of adequate response to Dave Dennis's report. Whether CORE will respond adequately or not remains to be tested by the months immediately ahead. But the report of Dave Dennis focuses on a problem with national and even international implications.

Dave Dennis did not bring to the CORE convention any remarkably new information. He told of a situation which is well known and commonly agreed upon across the United States.

I know there still are grounds for major complaints against the news coverage of civil rights activity in the South. But what I want to emphasize at this time is the widespread public acknowledgement that crimes, monstrous crimes, are being committed daily against American citizens.

And the reaction of the citizens of these United States is appallingly inadequate!

A church was bombed and four children died. William Moore and Medgar Evers were murdered. Mickey Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman have now been missing for so long that they are commonly presumed murdered. The list could easily be added to by those more knowledgeable than myself. But these instances are all commonly known. And in no case have the murderers been brought to justice.

Not long ago Kitty Genovese was murdered in New York City while many of her neighbors refused to heed her screams for help. The nation was appalled at the callousness of those New Yorkers. But at least the New York police have brought in a man for trial.

The same people who were shocked by the social indifference of those New Yorkers daily read in their morning papers of the brutality occurring in the deep South, mutter to their wives and families about that horrible situation in Mississippi, and go on about their business as if Mississippi were only as real as a Mickey Spillane novel. These people — and I mean you and I — are every bit as guilty as those people in New York who ignored Kitty Genovese's pleas. Perhaps we are even more guilty. We have had all kinds of opportunity to know and understand that crimes are being committed. They occur constantly and have occurred constantly over a long period of time, yet they continue to bring from the American people only sentimental and ineffective pity.

Our federal government's response to this situation is marked with political expediency and moral dishonesty. J. Edgar Hoover properly qualifies as chief villain with his recent bland remark, "the state of lawlessness is no more in the South than in the North." The FBI is supposed to be the citizen's protection against local police violating his fundamental rights. Needless to say the FBI has failed miserably to do its duty in Mississippi. But Mr. Hoover has long since learned to ape the favorite technique of Southern politicians. He merely shifts

the famous formula, "Cry nigger!" slightly to "Cry Communist!" and no President has dared to touch him.

Robert Kennedy, doubtless with a shrewd political eye cocked on the nearing Democratic convention, has kept himself as clean as possible from any news association with the recent tragic events in the Deep South. The ultimate responsibility for federal action, of course, is President Johnson's. But he is wrapped cocoon-like in overwhelming national popularity, and astute politician that he is, knows better than to risk his political security by moving too far ahead of national public opinion.

The threatening appearance of Barry Goldwater on the national scene only heightens the pathetic irony. Goldwater cries out with stern Anglo-Saxon — I can't really believe he ever knew what it is to be a Jew — righteousness against the criminality of our city streets while he is thunderously silent on the brutally organized criminality of the white Deep South. The political dialogue between Johnson and Goldwater may likely exclude the Southern racial problem altogether.

The frightening question is why haven't the American people exerted a massive pressure to make our federal government maintain at least the minimal standards of law and order?

The inability to answer that question makes Dave Dennis weep. More of us should weep. For there is something rotten and dead in America, and I'm not referring to the bodies of those civil rights workers who have been murdered. It seems to me entirely possible that dead as they are, they are the most viable portion of America today. America congratulates itself on a Civil Rights Bill and countenances murder at the same time. People all over the world can smell the stench, but here we have air conditioning.



If you want to soar with the eagles in the daytime — You don't hoot with the owls all nite. Relax, be fit, keep youthful zip — at Kerpan's St. Louis Sauna rock heat bath. Men only — noon to 2 a.m. daily. Park free. Where Maple, Hodiament, Skinker and Olive St. Rd. meet. 6100 west - 1000 north. At north end Skinker Blvd.

Chas. K. Berger

Lester Seasongood

COMMERCIAL INSURORS

721 Olive • GA 1-5047 • Saint Louis
COUNSEL—PROTECTION—SERVICE

“I Want Candy”

Ed Sachs

**A Saga About the
Chicago Police and
The Decent Versus
The Good People**

ONE afternoon, not too long ago, my wife finished reading *The New York Review of Books* and said to me, “I know what I want for my birthday. I want a copy of *Candy*.” My wife is always telling me what she wants for her birthday, which seems to occur every other week, so I did not answer. She said, “William Styron, one of my favorite writers, says ‘*Candy* in its best scenes is wickedly funny to read and morally bracing as only good satire can be.’” She added, “You write satire and therefore this would be a good present for you to buy me because it would help you in your work.” I pointed out to her that I was trying to do my work and that all this chatter about her birthday

was keeping me from it. She is a lady poet and said, "I am going to write an ode about you," and left the room.

The following Sunday, I picked up the *Chicago Sun-Times* in which I read a report by Hoke Norris, the literary editor, with a headline "No 'Candy' for Sale." From this report I learned that the publisher of the book had voluntarily withdrawn it from circulation in Chicago because in this city booksellers who handle allegedly obscene material are tried on criminal — not civil — charges. Throughout the day my wife kept muttering about her birthday present. During the next few days she came into my writing room with such reports as, "The reviewer for *Newsweek* liked *Candy*," and "Webster Schott gave *Candy* a good review in the *Kansas City Star*."

Three things were becoming apparent: (1) My wife wanted *Candy* for her birthday, (2) I couldn't get in trouble just by buying a book, although apparently my bookseller could for selling one, and (3) perhaps an account should be written about book censorship in Chicago.

In this city, public officials appear on television frequently to announce that they can perform their duties only with the cooperation of the public, and "... when the law-abiding citizens of Chicago cooperate in helping the police, we can and we will make Chicago a safer and a better place in which to live." The police department seemed a logical place to start. I called there and asked the friendly operator which policemen decided which books could be sold, and she said, "You want to speak to Sgt. Coffey. He's in Prostitution." I told her I was not interested in his hobbies, but I did want to talk to him. The next voice on the telephone was that of a female who said brightly, "Prostitution." Blushing, I asked for Sgt. Coffey. She said that he was out to lunch. I explained my reason for calling and she told me that I had better talk to Lt. Thomas Kernan, head of the police vice control unit. I told him what I wanted to do and wondered if he could give me the information I needed, mentioning that the article I was planning would probably be called "Chicago, The New Boston." This seemed to annoy Lt. Kernan who demanded to know why I would write such an article, who would publish it, and what my credentials were for writing such an article. I answered, "If books are

being censored to the degree that Mr. Norris has reported, Chicago is now very much like Boston used to be; and my credentials are that I am a tax-paying, law-abiding citizen of the city of Chicago asking for information from my police department." The lieutenant said that he would not discuss anything on the telephone, was in his office all afternoon every day, wanted me to come down to the police station with my credentials, and hung up.

I then called the public information division of the police department to ask what did Lt. Kernan mean by credentials? (I lost my birth certificate, I do not know how to drive a car, and having managed not to be arrested have no fingerprints on record.) A sweet-voiced woman told me to just come on down and there would be no trouble.

Suspecting that perhaps I was getting to be like that young lady on the tiger, I placed a call to the public relations director of G. P. Putnam's Sons, publisher of *Candy*. She was out. I left a request for her to call me back, collect, but have never heard from her.

Meanwhile, I collected all available information from the Chicago press about suppression of book selling activities.

The next day was my wife's birthday, and for a treat I took her with me to the police station. On the way we purchased a copy of *Chicago's American* which bore the headline: "2 COPS EXPOSED AS LOAN SHARKS, Brothers Linked to Juice Chief DeStefano." My wife said to me, "Some birthday! Where's my book?" And then, thoughtfully, "I bet those policemen will be in a dandy mood after seeing that headline." They weren't.

For 45 minutes we sat and waited in the Prostitution and Obscene Matter Unit of the Vice Control Division of the Chicago police department, while my wife tried not to look like a lady of the evening, and I tried to pretend I wasn't with her.

At last Lt. Kernan, a blonde young man, much larger than I, in his shirt-sleeves with a police revolver strapped to his belt consented to see us. I introduced my wife and told him that she would take down our conversation in shorthand.

I asked him some questions, such as, "If the police are engaged in book censorship, what are their qualifications for this kind of work? How many of these men have college de-

grees, and of those with college degrees, how many were English or literature majors?"

Lt. Kernan answered, "Did you clear this interview with Mel Mawrence, Director of Public Information? You will have to see him first."

He took us to another office for an interview with Mel Mawrence.

Mr. Mawrence, who kept asking me to repeat my questions and to speak up, wanted to see my credentials. I told him that I had handled writing assignments in almost every part of the country and had never encountered such a request. However, I showed him several samples of my published work including fiction in literary reviews, book reviews from the *Sun-Times*, and non-fiction in various other publications. To my surprise, he picked out of the pile an article I had written for a business publication on Motorola's marketing procedures. He didn't look at anything else. Apparently, I was accredited.

Since he was unfamiliar with Hoke Norris' column in the *Sun-Times* describing police activities in book censorship, I read parts of it to him, and asked if it were true that so-called objectionable books are purchased by plainclothesmen and then reviewed in the prostitution and obscene matter unit of the vice control division of the police department. He said that this was true, that it was done under a Municipal Code, and that the Knights of Columbus and the Citizens for Decent Literature were most active in the clamor for censorship. He further informed me that Mr. Edward Rekruciak of the Citizens for Decent Literature had received numerous citations for his excellent work. "Citations by whom?" I asked.

"Well, by the Citizens for Decent Literature."

Mr. Mawrence fielded almost every question by telling me that I would have to talk to the Corporation Counsel for the city of Chicago. He repeatedly referred to the book *Candy* as "salacious" until I pointed out to him that several people with considerable knowledge of literature did not agree with that definition of the book. Mr. Mawrence then said that we would have to see Police Captain Joseph B. Morris, deputy superintendent of inspectional services.

"Then why am I sitting here talking to you?" I asked.

"You have to clear through public relations to prove your competency," he replied.

I then quoted from a column by Jack Mabley which had appeared on June 2nd in *Chicago's American*, stating that Supt. Orlando W. Wilson had given orders to his policemen to "articulate our community standard of obscenity."

"Mr. Mabley was in error regarding the statement about Supt. Wilson," Mr. Mawrence said.

I then quoted from Kup's Column in *Chicago's Sun-Times* (June 8, 1964) in which Irv Kupcinec had written, "... Because of a threat of arrest of any bookseller peddling *Candy*, the publisher has withdrawn all copies from Chicago."

"That's not true. Besides, nobody pays any attention to what any of those columnists like Kup and Maggie Daly (a gossip columnist for *Chicago's American*) say. The things they print are often later proved to be untrue." Mr. Mawrence continued, "If you have any evidence of harassment, or threats of arrest, we would like to get it. Provide us with a name and circumstances and we will investigate. I have no knowledge of intimidation or harassment, but you as a private citizen can make any statement."

"You are saying, then, that you don't know of any harassment of booksellers?" I asked.

"No. I am saying that I have no knowledge of any harassment or threat of arrest," replied Mr. Mawrence.

At this point, since Mr. Mawrence had been so explicit about not being quoted as saying "I don't know of," preferring that it be "I have no knowledge of," my wife asked him what the difference was between these two statements. Mr. Mawrence said that there was no difference but that he refused to be quoted except as saying "I have no knowledge of."

Mr. Mawrence's answers to almost all my questions began sounding the same. I wanted to try to find out how widespread police activities were. I decided to ask him about a book to which no objections had been raised in recent years.

"What about the Bible?" I asked. "Would you consider that pornographic?"

Mr. Mawrence went through a long period of communion with himself before answering, "I don't want to discuss that."

I decided to pick an author who had been dead so long that his works could safely be considered of historical importance. "What about the writings of Voltaire? Would you call them pornographic?"

"Yes, in parts. Now I am speaking as an individual . . . unfortunately, because of the Constitution we cannot stop booksellers from stocking this book."

"Are the police harassing booksellers?"

"Well, tell us who these people are that claim harassment," Mr. Mawrence said.

I did tell him that I had spoken to a well-known distributor of books and periodicals, and he had volunteered the information that in his 40 years' experience in his field he had not experienced such pressure from the police department as at the present time.

Mr. Mawrence ignored this comment but began to tell me of his long life in the city of Chicago, ending his memoirs with the surprising suggestion that he would cooperate with me if I wanted to do "a story on police brutality."

Sitting as I was, in a building populated with policemen, I declined, saying, "That's another story, and maybe I'll do it later."

Mr. Mawrence then suggested that if I was determined to do a story on censorship I should submit any article I wrote to him for approval. I declined. He then said a few things about protecting the morality of young Chicagoans and I told him that I had adopted two children through the courts of this city with less difficulty and fewer questions than apparently I could buy a book.

I decided to try to conduct my next interview by telephone and was, by at least one standard, more successful. Brian Kilgallon is a member of the Corporation Counsel staff who appeared on behalf of the Chicago police department in the *Tropic of Cancer* embroglio.

The secretary in the Corporation Counsel offices told me that Mr. Kilgallon wasn't available, and when I asked her who read all the dirty books in their office, she said immediately, "Oh. That would be Mr. Port."

Mr. Port was much friendlier than anyone I had met at the police department. He cordially agreed that it was entirely proper for my wife to listen on the extension phone and take down our conversation in shorthand. He qualified himself as an expert in the field of censorship by stating that he had spent "most of the past three years reading dirty magazines." He began reeling off the titles and I didn't recognize any of them.

Knowing that a recent issue of *Playboy* magazine had been seized by the Corporation Counsel (and later released), I asked him about *Playboy*.

"*Playboy* is different," said Mr. Port, offering no further explanation.

I decided that magazines posed a different set of problems than books and tried to keep Mr. Port on the subject of the latter. But Mr. Port seemed to be an avid reader of magazines and wished to discuss them exclusively. He told me that it was terrible that some magazines were reporting "wife swapping parties." Mr. Port then gave me what apparently were some hangovers from his concluding charges to juries.

"The officials of Chicago are not against freedom because the people who run this city fought too long for their own freedoms."

"The purpose of education is to teach people proper concepts."

I told Mr. Port that I was pleased to hear such Jeffersonian statements, but the newspapers reported events of a completely different nature. Mr. Port said, "Columnists don't give accurate information."

"Why don't you do something about it?" I asked.

"The city of Chicago is not in the business of bringing lawsuits against every columnist."

I knew it was physically impossible for me to personally interview every bookseller. I thought, however, that I could reach them through advertising, and I called the *Sun-Times* and asked if the following ad could be run in their business personals section:

Booksellers — Details of police-other harassments, your selling activities needed by free lance writer. Write JJ31 SUN-TIMES.


The ad was accepted by the advertiser. Shortly afterwards I was informed by the newspaper that they wanted their lawyers to read the ad to see if it was acceptable. There were many more telephone calls to and from the classified advertising department of the *Sun-Times*. At last they informed me that they would run the ad if I would substitute the word "censorship" for "police." Like mehitabel, I figured "What the hell," and told them to go ahead.

Then, just to see what would happen, I phoned in my original ad to the *Chicago Tribune*, a newspaper that has from time to time made it known that it was against all these "smutty, obscene" books and would not allow them to be reviewed in its pages. The

Continued on page 23

St. Louis Transportation: A SHRINKING SUCCESS

HARRIETT WOODS



AFTER a year under public ownership, St. Louis' Bi-State transit can be acclaimed a steadily shrinking "success": the operation has been satisfactory, but the patient is failing.

Despite significant improvements and the benefits of consolidating 15 independent transit lines in St. Louis, St. Louis County, and East St. Louis, the future of public transit appears bleak. In its first year, Bi-State made two per cent less than expected, its expenses ran two per cent more, and the agency was unable to meet all its funding requirements for capital improvements.

In May, operating revenues fell \$85,000 under budget estimates. If the present trend continues, Bi-State will be forced to cut service or raise fares.

Of course the first year is the hardest, but the "fair record" described by a transit spokesman reflects: wishful thinking on prospective revenues and expenses under public ownership; the handicap of financing solely from the fare box which prevents subsidizing any dramatic changes; and insufficient interest in a "rapid transit" system.

Public ownership was proposed with the idea that tax benefits and retained profits would provide new

and improved services which, in turn, would induce motorists to use public transportation. (Now, well over half the commuters reach downtown St. Louis by car.)

Promoters of public ownership spoke of faster service, more passenger seats, and better schedules. Riders who still wait wearily at bus-stops for a chance to stand in a crowded aisle are disillusioned. Bi-State estimates it sold 100 million rides this year. Four years ago, the total for the area was 120 million. Next year, officials predict, it will drop further.

Declining use here almost exactly hits the national 3.8 per cent average annual drop in revenue, Bi-State says. Throughout the country, private and public operators have been caught in a squeeze between lessening patronage and increasing costs. In the Missouri-Illinois St. Louis area, the 15 private companies dominated by the St. Louis Public Service Company had fallen into the same pattern, with many of the smaller firms near bankruptcy.

"Bailing-Out" Operation?

BI-STATE Development Agency, an area authority established by the legislatures of Missouri and Illinois

to operate public projects and plan area development, sold a \$26,500,000 revenue bond issue with voter approval to buy the 15 transit lines. One former St. Louis city official calls this a "bailing-out" operation, indicating the private companies were happy to sell their failing businesses at a profit. The Agency paid \$23,194,740 for all lines, a figure well above real worth, but which Bi-State felt was "reasonable" considering the value of a unified system.

A private firm, Transit Services Corporation, was hired on a fixed-fee, five-year contract to manage the system beginning April 1, 1963. Former St. Louis Public Service Company officials dominate key positions in this firm. Transit Services claims to have done a good job. Among major accomplishments it cites:

Creation of a stable, more convenient and economic operation in one integrated system. There are now seven operating divisions instead of fifteen. Overlapping and competing lines were consolidated, and passengers previously forced to use two companies now have through service.

A uniform fare structure was established for the whole system

with both increases and reductions for individual users depending upon distances and zones. Double fares were eliminated and a \$12 unlimited-ride monthly pass instituted with savings for one-fourth of the system's riders.

Equipment has been improved, standardizing the bus fleet to virtually complete diesel operation. Purchase of additional air-conditioned buses brings the total to 550, the largest such fleet in the country.

Numerous extensions and service improvements have been made (such as extending certain Metro East lines into St. Louis), with emphasis on express lines and fuller utilization of express highways.

Eight new express lines have been inaugurated through \$357,754 federal underwriting. These lines will operate experimentally for one year to provide research information for the government and then will either prove financially feasible on a local basis or be abandoned.

The First Year

FIRST-year economies resulting from consolidation have saved Bi-State an embarrassing deficit. The agency's financial obligations are sharply defined. It not only must pay interest on its bonds, but is required to set aside a depreciation reserve of seven per cent of monthly revenue, and it must budget two per cent for a capital improvement fund.

In addition, Bi-State was confronted with the cost of a new two-year labor contract signed by the old Public Service Company just one day before the transfer of ownership. This provided a series of four 5c-an-hour increases, which were applied to all acquired lines.

At the end of 12 months of operation, Bi-State reported covering all costs but budgeted capital improvement funds, which showed just a \$28,320 balance. This is a depressingly slim margin. Permanent failure to amass capital funds would prevent major improvements. Bi-State hopes to improve its record next year despite an expected one million dollar drop-off in revenues.

Yet, in the first new fiscal month, May, the company failed by \$42,868 to meet its depreciation and capital fund requirements.

To balance expenses, Bi-State has only the fare box. It has no taxing

authority and no assets. The Bi-State Agency can issue revenue bonds for each project it undertakes (Gateway Arch trains and Granite City docks, for example), but each bond issue stands alone.

Thus if the decline continues, and operating expenses cannot be pared, Bi-State would have to "reduce service or raise fares," according to Col. R. E. Smyser, Jr., executive director of Bi-State. Ironically, either choice would accelerate the downward spiral. Col. Smyser does not see this crisis occurring in the next year but will not predict beyond that. S. Carl Robinson, administrative officer for Transit Services, takes a more hard-headed attitude about this eventuality: "Our objective must be to keep the level of service consistent with use. This means shrinking the system to accommodate decline."

He cited Cincinnati, with its \$12,000,000 transit system, as an example of a healthy, small operation. "We have a \$23,000,000 business now," Robinson said, "but we can shrink to Cincinnati's size and still have a sound operation."

This may console the economy-minded but hardly meets the dreams of those who hoped that public ownership would put the "mass" back into transit.

Any Hope?

WHAT can be done to break the pattern?

In the first place, no more should be expected of the present set-up than it can provide. In the first year, money saved through exemption from taxes just about balanced the huge \$2,200,000 drop in revenue from the total received by private operators.

In order to reverse the decline, the St. Louis transit system must assure fast, frequent, sit-down service. It is clear Bi-State will not accumulate the earnings needed to finance this expansion.

If area residents do indeed want something more from public transit, they will have to explore other approaches. The Gilman report of 1959 (a St. Louis Metropolitan Area Transportation Study by W. C. Gilman & Company) proposed a \$175,000,000 off-street rapid transit system utilizing buses on both existing expressways and 41.8 miles of grade-separated roadways. It also proposed an elevated roadway loop in the downtown area reserved for bus loading, additional park-ride facilities, and bus terminals.

Recognizing that such proposals would require a public subsidy, the Gilman report recommended a \$20 annual tax on automobiles. The suggested auto tax emphasized the close relationship between use of private cars and transit problems. Owners of automobiles registered in the area would receive a reduced rate on monthly bus passes contingent upon paying the annual tax.

One of the main arguments used by those who had proposed transit ownership by the City of St. Louis rather than Bi-State was the city's ability to raise money through taxation.

In the supplementary Gilman report of 1960 which studied the feasibility of Bi-State transit ownership, the present consolidation was recommended for its area coverage and as "a first and necessary step toward a staged development of rapid transit service."

This was cited by Col. Smyser. He indicated present concern would continue to lie in improving the existing system and that this might be considered a "stage" of development. However, in bureaucratic parlance, there is as yet not even a committee to study the advisability of having a committee on rapid transit.

A Senate-passed bill to provide transit grants just released by the House Rules Committee would be of little help in St. Louis, according to Col. Smyser. The funds to be provided require matching contributions and, without taxing authority, Bi-State would have no ability to raise sizeable amounts.

A great many people feel federal and state assistance is appropriate. In the absence of area-wide rapid transit, more and more government money goes into roads to carry automobiles which jam streets, pollute the air, and require valuable parking space. Then more assistance is needed to unjam the streets, unpollute the air, and build bigger and better parking garages.

Preparation of plans for radically altering the system will take time. Educating the public to approve financing will take even more. At present, there is no official in St. Louis working in either of these directions.

Harriett Woods is known to our readers for her reports on "Urban Renewal in University City" and "The Barnes Hospital Controversy." She has extensive experience in the media field.

Joseph Cardinal Ritter

BY C. G. CONDON



Two Bishops In a Time Of Change



Bishop Charles H. Helmsing

BY JAMES M. JOHNSON

CATHOLIC priests of the St. Louis Archdiocese need no permission from the Chancery office to take part in civil rights demonstrations, declared Joseph Cardinal Ritter.

This statement, the latest among many laying out a progressive and aggressive policy for his Archdiocese, is typical for Ritter who was the leading American at the Ecumenical Council in Rome, and among the dozen or so most influential participants. To the European delegates it was a surprise that so liberal a Cardinal should be an American and, on occasion, even act as spokesman for the "reactionary" U. S. hierarchy. But as became clear during the sessions, the prominence and outspokenness of such arch conservatives as Cardinals Spellman of New York and McIntyre of Los Angeles have overshadowed the more moderate position of their American colleagues.

In Cardinal Ritter's view, many

U. S. bishops did in fact go to Rome thinking themselves to be conservative. But once there, they were pleasantly surprised to find that they, too, were in favor of updating the Church.

Until the Council, few U.S. bishops had given much thought to the need for or even to the possibility of change. Unlike their European counterparts they have always been preoccupied with running their dioceses, founding new parishes, and building schools in what remains essentially a missionary country for the Church. Cardinal Ritter has been the exception. While not a scholar, he is a voracious and catholic reader. Having given much thought to the need for modernization, he arrived in Rome with his own visions of what the Council should accomplish. He helped his fellow Americans formulate their ideas, occasionally forcing them to look at issues they would rather have ignored.

Two years ago, April 3, 1962, the Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing was installed as the Roman Catholic bishop of Kansas City-St. Joseph with great pomp. He marked his second anniversary this year by celebrating a mass in the private chapel of the diocesan chancery offices, surrounded by the laymen and priests who work daily with him.

The contrast between the two ceremonies, given the distinctions of the two events and the rubrics of Catholic ceremonies, still shows something of the bishop's character. A quiet, modest man, Bishop Helmsing prefers simplicity. He laughs heartily and frequently. He is direct, but tactful.

Bishop Helmsing is proving to be a good bishop, one who is growing both as a person and as a priest. He would attribute this growth to the Holy Spirit and, while not disagreeing, it may be possible to cite at least two avenues that the Spirit seems to have taken in his life.

The first undoubtedly is the Second Vatican Council. And the second is intimately linked with the first — the tremendous impact of the ecumenical movement, the effort among Christians to restore unity among themselves.

While he was bishop of the diocese of Springfield-Cape Girardeau — he was its first ordinary — Bishop Helm-

sing served 34,000 Catholics in 39 Southern Missouri counties. But the total population was about 800,000. Catholics obviously were but a drop in an ocean of Protestants. He had the experience of getting to know Protestants on a much more personal basis than many prelates, protected as they often are by large Catholic populations.

When he first was appointed the new bishop of Kansas City-St. Joseph, Bishop Helmsing mentioned in one of his first interviews the subject of Christian unity.

"I think the spirit of God," he said, "is moving us all to cooperation and unity. People are getting back to what God wants rather than what they want. I hope I can have some small part in the worldwide movement of Christian unity."

The bishop was installed in Kansas City only a little more than six months before the opening of the Second Vatican Council. He flew off to Rome in October of that year, a relatively unknown bishop among more than 2,000 assembled in St. Peter's basilica for the first general council in almost 100 years.

But he went to Rome with at least one passion — the vernacular mass, the eucharistic feast celebrated in the language of the people. He had seen how much of a barrier the Latin had



The Cardinal is retiring by nature, cheerful, with a keen sense of humor. He is also open-minded — unlike many other bishops. At the Council, Ritter presented his views on each topic without waiting to see how opinion was developing. His fluency in the prescribed language, of course, was of great help. While he refused to engage in any politicking, his independence and his personality brought him considerable influence.

Cardinal Ritter is a liberal by any standards. While many of the conservative bishops of the Eastern seaboard are a product of the American College in Rome where the traditionalist influence of the Curia (a sort of papal cabinet) is strong, priests from the Middle West are trained near their homes. Ritter studied at the Saint Meinrad Seminary in Indiana, a Benedictine institution. Midwestern Catholics have long held a more liberal view of the world and their Church, partly because a more edu-

cated class of Catholics migrated from Europe to the Middle West. Typically, the Cardinal's early environment was among liberal German Catholics.

He was one of the first bishops to desegregate a school system while at Indianapolis. Shortly after his transfer to St. Louis, he became the first bishop to integrate parochial schools in a border area. He squelched the segregationists with warnings of possible excommunication. This was in 1947 long before the Supreme Court decision on public schools. In recent months, the Cardinal has intensified his efforts for full equality for the Negro. A symposium on racial matters was mandatory for all priests in the diocese. They were instructed on how to encourage their parishioners to invite Negroes to move into their neighborhood. Cardinal Ritter was also the first U.S. prelate to launch the now nationwide dialogues among

Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders.

U. S. bishops have long enjoyed virtual autonomy. The National Catholic Welfare Conference, though it includes all U.S. bishops, is little more than a debating society with no authority over individual members. Currently Cardinal Ritter is seeking to endow the American Council with a measure of authority. Presumably, he feels most of the bishops are liberal and that Council decisions would tend in that direction. The change would further decentralize the power structure of the Church, with fewer decisions made in Rome. It is revealing that the chief opposition comes from the conservative bishops.

It would have been far more difficult for Ritter to have taken some of his positions, had he been saddled with a reactionary diocese. Last fall, at the second session, the Cardinal's most noteworthy contribution was his one-man crusade for a revival of the

represented in his former diocese with its preponderance of Protestants. He saw, too, that understanding was not assisted but hindered by use of the Latin. His appointment to a committee on the liturgy, set up by the American bishops, was as much a tribute to the program instituted by his predecessors, Bishop John Cody and Archbishop Edwin V. O'Hara, as to himself.

Despite his enthusiasm for the vernacular, Bishop Helmsing spoke little at the Council, preferring instead to submit his ideas in writing to the appropriate conciliar commissions. He lived at first in a hotel near the Vatican but later moved to a residence operated by nuns at which bishops from many lands also lived.

The first session of the Council had a profound effect upon its participants. The bishops unexpectedly were confronted with many uncomfortable facts. The Roman Catholic Church was locked within the past, with a theology ruled by woodenly unimaginative interpreters of the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas and very largely irrelevant to the lives of most Catholics, a defensive mentality that still was fighting the battles of the Reformation, a preoccupation with mechanical and institutional forms, a subtle but damaging fear of the realities of the world. The first Council session

saw all of this tottering under an unexpected yet generally successful assault.

But, their minds rebelling at all but the usual responses, many bishops found this movement toward reform and renewal distasteful, upsetting, and perhaps dangerous. Others, including Bishop Helmsing, although suffering from the shocks being administered to the old familiar ways, found it within themselves to learn from the momentous events swirling about them.

Soon after his return, Bishop Helmsing joined with Bishop Edward R. Welles of the Episcopal diocese of West Missouri in discussing the Council and the unity movement in a program at an Episcopal church. It was the first time the leaders of either community had appeared together on the same program.

"Throughout the Council," Bishop Helmsing reported, "the fresh idea prevailed of bringing the church 'up to date,' yet doing so without watering down the faith."

In the wake of the hopes aroused by the first session, the bishop received more invitations to address other Christian groups. His outward appearance of calm at these programs was no indication of the interior uncertainties he many times felt. Although sometimes discomfort-

ing, the bishop's appearances helped to prepare him for the second session of the Council — in which the subject of ecumenism finally came up for discussion — and for further contacts locally with other Protestants.

Recently he referred to this period when he observed:

"We are apt to be rather clumsy in our first approaches. Still, since Pope John opened the doors and windows of the church, we are making good progress and feeling more at home with our fellow Christians. And I think our dialogue will become increasingly fruitful."

That was a public statement. Privately, the bishop confided to a friend sometime last year in the interval between conciliar sessions that he found it extremely difficult at first to talk meaningfully with Protestants. Although this reaction may seem strange to many Protestants, it is widespread among Catholics. Many factors are responsible: isolation from the mainstream of American religious life for many decades, the defensiveness of a minority in an "alien" environment, a sentimental, non-theological security about exclusive possession of religious truth, among other forces. But all combine to make the Catholic uncomfortable when he becomes involved with those from outside the familiar neighbor-

preaching tradition of the Church, a call well received by the Protestant churches wherein preaching customarily occupies a far more prominent place. The Cardinal was concerned over what he considered the relative neglect of scripture and the need for instruction by means of sermons. At many Masses, particularly in parts of Europe there are no sermons at all. And conceivably it was in response to Ritter's appeal, that several months later Pope Paul formally directed that preaching be made an integral part of the Mass.

Ritter also played a major role in the liturgical changes, the only major completed action of the Council to date. He is one of two Americans on the commission charged with responsibility for spelling out those changes and putting them into effect. When during an interview, the writer made the mistake of referring to these liturgical changes as minor compared to some other matters before the Council, he was promptly

rebutted. As the Cardinal put it, "The liturgy involves the most vital thing the Church does — to render glory to God. This is the greatest act man can perform — to give glory and honor to God." It's perhaps not altogether incidental that the changes, particularly the saying of Mass in the vernacular rather than Latin, tend to give greater importance to the word. This, too, is welcomed by Protestants who see it as bringing the word into a better balance with the sacraments of the Church.

The cardinal strongly supported the concept of collegiality, the thesis that the bishops should share in the papal authority, which would be well received in Protestant circles. However, the cardinal does argue that it should be up to the Pope himself to decide how much of his authority he will share.

LOOKING ahead to what could be the third and final session of the

Council this fall, Ritter is most concerned about the resolution on liberty of conscience, which, despite its recent implicit endorsement by Pope Paul, is in difficulty. He is bitterly opposed by most of the Italian and Spanish bishops. As a citizen of a country with a strong tradition of religious liberty, Cardinal Ritter would like a statement on the subject to "reassure the Protestant majorities in this country and elsewhere who are fearful of the day when Catholics might be in the majority." Having had a Catholic president has given them some assurance, "but they would also like to have some statement, some document from a high level."

Ritter believes that a council statement on liberty of conscience would tend to free the Church of the suspicion that, once in power, it becomes intolerant, a suspicion still not without basis in fact in various parts of the world. This he favors strongly because he believes that the fostering of

hood. Some priests, nuns and laymen, as well as bishops, can never overcome this initial fear.

With the experiences of the conciliar interval bolstering him, Bishop Helmsing returned to Rome for the second session last fall. He resided in the same religious house. He met on a much more personal basis many bishops from other countries. He attended meetings of the American hierarchy. And, most importantly, he talked at great length socially with many of the Protestant observer-delegates who frequently dropped into the Instituto di San Tomaso for a libation and good theological conversation.

His personal qualities as well as his insights into the question of ecumenism began to have an effect.

The bishop's written interventions also were impressing many of the prelates. An Irish newsman, who knows the British hierarchy well, said that several bishops had told him that Bishop Helmsing "was a coming man" and "had much to say on Christian unity."

The bishop's advancement also may have been assisted by Joseph Cardinal Ritter, archbishop of St. Louis, under whom — and certainly at whose recommendation — Bishop Helmsing was raised to the hierarchy in 1949 as

the then archbishop's auxiliary. Previously, Bishop Helmsing had served as Cardinal Ritter's personal secretary. The bishop was born in Shrewsbury in suburban St. Louis County, March 23, 1908, and was ordained in St. Louis in 1933. In 1956, again most certainly at Cardinal Ritter's suggestion, he was made the first bishop of the newly created Springfield-Cape Girardeau diocese. In Rome, Bishop Helmsing frequently saw the cardinal, both socially and in connection with the work of the Council.

The Secretariat of Christian Unity, established under the leadership of Augustin Cardinal Bea, German Jesuit, by Pope John XXIII and the object of considerable opposition by the more conservative members of the hierarchies and the Roman Curia, began considering the enlargement of its membership shortly after the second session opened. Bishop Helmsing was known to be under consideration but, for purposes of better resisting the attacks of the powerful conservative wing, it was decided that archbishops, because of their prestige and influence, were to be appointed.

Then Pope Paul determined that the conciliar commissions were to be increased in membership as a means of breaking the conservative dead-

lock. The new members were chosen by the Council fathers. Bishop Helmsing was elected to the Secretariat for Christian Unity. He received the second largest number of votes.

The same day, Bishop Helmsing arose in the Council to ask a question many of the bishops themselves wanted to raise. The Council was debating the draft on Christian unity. It had been brought to the floor only after a fierce struggle with the conservatives. They continued the fight by preventing a vote on accepting the draft's last two chapters — religious liberty and the statement on the Jews — as the basis for discussion, although such a vote had been promised. Bishop Helmsing concluded his remarks by asking when the vote might be taken.

The bishop's question unleashed tremendous applause.

SEVERAL months ago, Dr. Robert McAfee Brown, noted Presbyterian theologian and one of the Protestant delegate-observers at the Council, referred to the bishop's intervention at an inter-faith program in Kansas City:

"Out of 2,200 bishops . . . there was only one who had the courage to call forthrightly and unambiguously for the vote. . . . The one who asked the question on everybody's mind, who forced the Council to be re-

the ecumenical spirit is one of the principal, if not the principal, goals of the Council. As he told the assembly, its work marks the "end of the Counter Reformation at last."

This fall, the cardinal will also be in the vanguard of the progressives seeking final approval of the statement on the Jews, absolving them of specific responsibility in the death of Christ. Its purpose, he says, "would be to show the world and all Catholics once and for all that there is no justification in theology for anti-Semitism."

The cardinal has been most outspoken in his criticism of the Curia's role in blocking and delaying the clear sentiments of a majority of the assembled bishops. During the last session, Ritter called for a declaration — which was not forthcoming — "that the Curia has no independent existence but is solely an instrument of the papacy." He favors the proposal to replace most of the curial func-

tions with a council of rotating bishops from all over the world who would serve in an advisory capacity to the Pope. He believes the Curia will be unable to block the more important items on which a majority of the bishops desire action.

The cardinal's eagerness for further sessions — he has suggested holding councils every ten years — is indicative of how deeply he feels the need for a constant reevaluation of the Church's role in a rapidly changing world. The goal, as he sees it, is a more dynamic Church with more stress on the role of the layman; a Church oriented to the people rather than to its own organizational structure, and a Church looking outward rather than inward.

G. C. Condon is a resident of St. Louis with extensive background in the news media.

mind of an urgent ecumenical need — the need for an unequivocal statement on religious liberty — was your own Bishop Helmsing."

In March, Bishop Helmsing returned to Rome for a meeting of the Secretariat of Christian Unity, called to revise the draft for action by the full Council in the third session this fall.

"I expect an even stronger statement than the one made by Pope Paul at the opening of the second session," he observed on his return.

But even more important than the bishop's work with the secretariat — at least for his own personal development — was the private audience he had with Pope Paul while in Rome. The Pope received him without formality and as an expert on Christian unity. After a long talk, the bishop was preparing to kneel for the pontiff's blessing. Paul, however, seized him and embraced him warmly. The embrace — the kiss of peace, as it is known — profoundly moved Bishop Helmsing.

At home, the bishop has been emphasizing the necessity of vital reforms within the structure of the local church. He also has strongly supported a public accommodations ordinance in a recent referendum in Kansas City; he personally has acted to end any discrimination which

might exist in the institutional life of the diocese; and he also has urged Catholics to take an interest in and support the strengthening of the public school system as well as the Catholic parochial schools.


The bishop's stand on discrimination has been particularly strong. When he discovered that the Kansas City Club, of which he was an honorary member, did not serve Negroes, he publicly resigned his membership and issued a statement deploring the club's policy.

"I willingly concede that private clubs have a right to set down rules and qualifications for membership," he said at the time. "But they do not have any right to establish a restriction which places an unjustified stigma upon a whole people."

The bishop's personal stand led to the shifting of several dinners by Catholic groups from the club to restaurants which do not practice discrimination.

It has been only two years since Bishop Helmsing came to Kansas City, but to most Catholics and other Christians it has been one of the most promising periods in the religious life of the community.

James M. Johnson is on the staff of the Kansas City Star.



MASTERS OF SALES MEETING PLANNING

The world-famous, newly redecorated, newly remodeled Sherman House, with its 1500 rooms, has set smart, new standards for V.I.P. salesmen, executives and conventioners.

Free TV and radio. Air-conditioned. Drive-in garage parking. And our location right in the heart of Chicago makes the Sherman House the right place to stay in Chicago. Your company or association will appreciate our fabulous facilities, whether for 5 or for 5,000. Your comptroller will appreciate our guaranteed special rates.

Want to know more?

Call or write:

Joe Osajda, General Manager

Daniel Amico, Gen. Sales Manager


**SHERMAN
HOUSE**
CHICAGO


Phone: FR 2-2100

Single Rooms From \$8.00

Double Rooms From \$12.00

Suites From \$30.00





Are You A Liberal Or A Conservative?

WHEN in heat, politicians have a dangerous tendency to issue the clarion call to conservatives or liberals. Their failure to understand the socio-psychological implications of both these misused tags (and the fact that they often have little to do with party affiliation) leads to many an election day upset.

The dividing line between a liberal and a conservative cuts far deeper than a man's political persuasion; the difference is inherent in his very nature. Either concept might be defined as a life attitude, or a frame of reference and, as such, influences much more than merely the way a man votes. Most social scientists believe it colors the way he tolerates his youngster's rebellion, reacts to his business associates, suggestions, or accepts the newest form of pop art.

Reduced to its simplest terms, perhaps the two postures can best be described as leaning backward or reaching forward. The question is why do some men assume one or the other of these positions? (In practical terms, most men are a little of both.)

Conservatism and liberalism, according to the authors of a major study of personality and ideology conducted at the University of Minnesota, headed by Professor Herbert McClosky, are polar positions around which men of certain temperaments are drawn. The conservative doctrine expresses the needs of, and is highly correlated with, a distinct type of personality.

For the benefit of those interested parties who may have to win his vote, get his approval for a raise, or just learn how to live with him, the conservative in his most extreme form — there are many varying degrees — is poorly adjusted, insecure and ridden with guilt.

After measuring people in the sample according to where they stood on a scale of traditional conservative principles they were then scored

in a battery of social attitude and personality scales. The difference between the extreme conservative and the extreme liberal was clear enough to draw two distinct personality profiles. For example:

- hostility—71% (C.); 18% (L.)
- political suspiciousness (mistrust of others)—55% (C.); 14% (L.)
- ethnic prejudice—71% (C.); 11% (L.)
- intolerance of weakness—54% (C.); 8% (L.)
- rigidity—60% (C.); 18% (L.)
- inability to handle ambiguity (all things must be black or white, and neatly pegged)—67% (C.); 12% (L.)

These and a host of similar personality findings led researchers to conclude that the conservative doctrine, which places great emphasis on tradition and order, satisfies the psychological needs of its adherents who, according to these measurements, fear uncertainty, change and free inquiry. It is not accidental, they point out, that the conservative individual regards man as weak and wicked, and that the conservative doctrine is based, according to leading spokesman Clinton Rossiter, on the concept of original sin. Translated into political terms, the controls (to regulate imperfect mankind) called for by the doctrine express some of the deepest needs of the conservative personality.

ONE of the clearest findings in the study is that, contrary to popular belief, conservatism is not the philosophy of the intellectually elite but rather of the uninformed and poorly educated. The most conservative elements of the sample were also the most poorly educated. As the educational level rose, the respondents grew more liberal in their outlook. This could be why the authority of the neighborhood cop or the local

ward leader carries the most weight among the lower classes who, at the same time, are the most suspicious of anything outside their own immediate world — such as the “big shots” in Washington.

To a large degree this corroborates many of the conclusions of the classic study in the field conducted in California by a group of scientists headed by T. W. Adorno of the Institute of Social Research. This project, the first major attempt to link personality and political ideology, originated as a study of prejudice and the potential fascist. From it emerged the profile of a new type of personality — the authoritarian.

This new species was found to bear an uncomfortable resemblance to the arch-type conservative. He, too, is found to be, among many other things, rigid in his thinking, intolerant of ambiguity and loaded down with preconceived notions and prejudices. Like his half-brother, the extreme conservative, he is insecure (i.e., hostile and suspicious) and conforming. Paradoxically, while he is power-oriented and authoritarian in his relations to those weaker than himself, he is at the same time submissive and passive to those stronger than himself.

To assess where this new breed of man stood in the liberal-conservative dimension, he was measured against a Political-Economic Conservatism scale. Correlation between this measurement and that of the total picture of the authoritarian was close enough for the researchers to conclude that the authoritarian personality was more than likely to be a political conservative.

Attitudes tested on the PEC scale dealt with such key concepts as continuance of the status quo; resistance to social change; balance of power between labor, business and government; and life values. On the latter, for example, conservatives regarded poverty as a result of individual incompetence — “people get what they



A Revealing Study By Social Scientists

deserve," or "God helps those who help themselves." Liberals viewed it as the fault of our political-economic structure.

Follow-up personal interviews tested attitudes on such specific issues as taxes, health insurance, communism and unions. Conservatives thought of unions as an organized racket comparable to organized crime, while liberal criticism was based on labor's interest in feathering its own nest rather than aiming at a better society. It is significant to note that even where there was a yes or no agreement on an issue, the reasons for agreement were vastly different.

To confuse the two camps even further, a third type of personality — the pseudo-conservative — was found. This breed of man hides under the cloak of conventional conservatism (and sometimes liberalism). Although he seems to defend American institutions and values, he — consciously or unconsciously — is driven by violent and destructive instincts aimed at abolishing that which he ostensibly wishes to safeguard. His fanatic eagerness to defend God and country can drive him to the lunatic fringe at either end of the pole.

As in the Minnesota study, it was found that the more ignorant and confused people were about political issues, the more likely they were to be conservative. They fear change because they cannot understand it. The anti-intellectual attitude of conservatives on all educational levels is also explained in terms of fear. To them, the intellectual is a potential radical (a Bohemian) who threatens to change the established order which conservatives, either because of vested interests or psychological needs, want to perpetuate. Rather than take a chance of upsetting the apple cart by too much questioning, they often prefer to accept superficial or even distorted information.

This kind of intellectual dodging leads back to two infantile thought

processes. A person, unwilling or unable to understand a political situation, either falls back on stereotype thinking (the bad guy and the good guy) through which he interprets situations in terms of pre-conceived, over-generalized notions; or he may resort to personalization, a process of evaluating issues one can't understand in terms of the personalities identified with them. It is easier to talk about names than issues. This is a favorite device of the pseudo-intellect.

A follow-up study, conducted by Dr. Else Frenkel-Brunswik and designed to dig into the whys and wherefores of the authoritarian personality, found that it stems from an oppressive parent-child relationship. In families where the parents' attitude is oppressive and punitive and does not allow children to express a normal amount of rebellion (where they would never dare, regardless of the circumstances, to shout back, "I hate you, Pop,"), the children repress aggressions and hostilities that later spill over into their adult attitudes on political, economic and social issues. A threatening father figure seems to lurk in the background of many an authoritarian — the resulting intimidation is covered up under a rough, masculine front.

Affection in these homes is conditional to approved behavior. Discipline is rigid, and the relationship is one of dominance and submission rather than of equalitarianism. Perhaps it was just coincidental, but these same parents also had unfulfilled social aspirations and, as a result, were very status conscious. This was communicated to (and inculcated in) their children in terms of rigid, materialistic values.

These results were further investigated in a later analysis of the open and closed mind in which Dr. Mitton Rokeach found that the inability to

criticize one's parents led both to dogmatism and to anxiety.

Tests revealed that people who were the most dogmatic were the least able to express any ambivalence about their parents — in describing them they glorified them in such terms as "best in the world."

On the other hand, people with open minds described their parents with frank ambivalence — "He was a good guy but he was quick tempered." At the same time, those who were least critical recalled having expressed the most symptoms of childhood anxiety — bed wetting, nail biting, nightmares, thumb sucking, walking and talking while asleep.

In far less psychiatric terms, Andrew Hacker, Professor of government at Cornell, recently analyzed the composition of the new conservative movement and found it claimed as followers the nouveaux of the business world. Still shaky about their newly-achieved rank in the world of big business, they are anxious to identify completely with top management and to disassociate themselves politically and socially from the group they just left behind. They have little tolerance for the misfortunes of the lower classes (they see taxes as a means of supporting the indolent), and regard any change in the political or economic tide as a threat to their own security.

Unfortunately, none of these studies gives as clear a picture of the liberal personality. The Minnesota researchers suggest with some qualifications that most of those people who rejected the values of conservatism would meet the definitions of a liberal. The California study briefly sketches the outlines of a genuine liberal, (again there are many grades and variations), who is described as outspoken and of great moral courage — he cannot keep silent over a wrong, even if speaking up endangers him.

Strongly individualistic, the liberal cannot stand any outside interference with his personal convictions anymore than he wishes to interfere with those of others. His ego is well developed but he is rarely narcissistic. Emotionally, he is unrepressed to the point where he sometimes has difficulty in keeping himself under control. As an anti-totalitarian, he has great compassion for the weak and identifies with the underdog.

Unlike his counterpart at the opposite end of the scale, the liberal's parents were less condemnatory, more permissive and freer with their love toward him and toward people in general. As a result, he thinks in terms of love rather than power. Because he has been able to express disagreement with his parents, he has attained greater independence from them and from authority of all kinds. Brought up without excessive fears of punishment, he is relatively free from fear about his own weaknesses and, therefore, can pity the weak. Because his personality is better integrated, he is more flexible and less likely to form stereotyped opinions. He is much better able to analyze his own faults and be objective about himself than is the conservative, and he is able to be more objective about the world.

The question is — how consistently do these personality patterns carry over into all realms of a man's life? Do they really influence his choice of a Wyeth painting over one by Pollock; his decision to expand into a new market or stand pat; his purchase of a new growth stock over blue chip securities; his willingness to let his teenagers support causes he may disapprove of?

Most authorities, including some of the men who worked on the California study, feel that if three important variables — social, economic and educational levels — are all equal, it is possible to predict the personality factor through a man's life.

Others disagree. Dr. McClosky feels, for example, that the many different facets of liberalism-conservatism (social, economic, etc.) cannot be positively inter-correlated in all instances.

In any event it would seem that political strategists, who hope to rally a crowd around the polls in November, would do well to bone up on their social psychology. Their big pitch might pay off better if they knew more about the kind of man they were pitching to.

Reprinted from *NEWS FRONT, Management's News Magazine*, March 1964 issue.

THE TROUBLE WITH LABOR

Walter P. Reuther

WE are in deep trouble in America, but not because our system of freedom is unequal to the challenge. We are in trouble because we are not trying. We are playing out on the outer fringes of our basic problems, for we have failed to fully comprehend the dimension and the character of the challenge we face or to understand the technological revolution shaping our tomorrow and which is creating serious economic and social dislocations. Yet, the new technology offers us the brightest opportunities for progress and fulfillment that man has ever had.

We have not fully understood the revolution — the rising expectations of nationalism — now shaping the lives of half of the people of the world. Nor have we recognized fully the nature of the social revolution called "civil rights" at home. We are on trial in America. American democracy has all of the advantages, but despite these advantages we are failing because we have failed to commit our resources to meet the real needs of our world.

Talk to the have-not peoples of Asia and Africa and Latin America who have an income of less than \$100 a year, who live in poverty and desperation. They are being swept forward in the great revolution of rising expectations, and they are looking at us. They have not made up their minds whether our social system is the answer to their problems or whether the system symbolized by Mr. Khrushchev is the answer.

Nor are these the only have-not people in the world. We have millions of have-not people right here in America. We have millions of unemployed. We have millions of underprivileged. We have the migratory workers, and the millions in the minority groups who suffer discrimination, denial, and deprivation. Those who live in the sub-basement of the American social structure and who are engulfed in the pockets of poverty are also judging America. They are the forgotten Americans, the invisible poor, whose lives are barren and with-

out purpose. They are victims of social neglect and callous indifference, left to shift for themselves by the more affluent part of America. They are judging our society in much the same way as the have-not peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Those whom our society neglects will not be influenced by pious platitudes about the virtues of American democracy. They will not be influenced by the slick slogans of Madison Avenue. They will judge us by the only true standards of worth and quality of any society; not how rich, or productive, or how highly developed is our technology but by what we do with what we now have.

The unemployed in America can't pay their rent, feed their kids or assure them of a decent education with some theoretical economic potential. Their problems will be solved only as American society develops the social mechanisms, policies, and programs which translate technological progress into opportunities for human fulfillment.

This is the central task of the American labor movement. The church groups can moralize. That is their role, that is their responsibility. The great industrial firms were not organized to solve human problems. General Motors was organized not even to make automobiles. That is a by-product. General Motors was organized to make profit.

We in the labor movement are the only group with economic and political leverage and social motivation. Unless we make this fight, the fight will not be made and American democracy will be unequal to the challenge it faces at home and in the world. That is why American labor must get on the march.

There are many serious and tragic deficits in the quality of American society. Overcoming these deficits must be given the highest national priority if we are to be equal to this challenge.

From "The Values We Cherish" by Walter P. Reuther.



I WANT CANDY

Continued from page 13

ad-taker took the ad without comment, and it ran as dictated. Not only was the situation depressing, it was becoming confusing.

I then talked to Walter J. Minton, president of the firm that published *Candy* and also *Fanny Hill*:

"It wasn't only the Chicago police but our inability to get anybody to defend 'Fanny Hill.' We were unable to get any help from the universities out there, and just didn't want to get involved again in trying to put up a defense. We talked to the people in the English departments at Northwestern and the University of Chicago and couldn't get anybody who was interested. Some of them had been involved first with 'Tropic of Cancer,' and then the *Playboy* case, and here was another one, 'Fanny Hill,' and it was just too much.

"In an atmosphere like that, it would be hard to say, 'Come on, boys, we're right behind you.' It's my impression that most of the booksellers in Chicago didn't buy 'Candy.' We just don't want to get involved in another case. We think the cards are a little bit stacked out there, against the publisher. In the first place, there's the way it was handled. The police go out and arrest somebody on a criminal charge — it's not a civil case — and it's been hard to get support from the literary community.

"The police have got what they wanted. They've got censorship out there. It's the most severe city in the United States."

I asked Mr. Minton if the book publishers, as an industry, could do anything about this situation. I can only describe his answer as a bitter, defeated snort.

I then called the literary agency for Terry Southern, one of the co-authors of *Candy*. The agency said: . . . It was surprised to hear that the book had been withdrawn from the Chicago market and this was the first information they had had about such an action.

. . . They didn't know what they, as a literary agency, were supposed to do about the situation.

. . . They couldn't give me Terry Southern's telephone number because he was somewhere on the west coast on a movie writing assignment and wasn't supposed to be bothered.

I tried to point out that Chicago was a city of considerable size, and

that if I were a writer whose book had been banned in a city that was the second-size market in the country, I would want my agency to know about it, to do something about it, and to make me available to any reporter wishing to write a story in defense of my book. However, Mr. Southern's agency did not agree with me.

Feeling a need for diversion, I picked up *The Village Voice*, a newspaper of Greenwich Village, to read of the freer life in the big city. There I read an account by Eric Bentley of how the District Attorney of Nassau County had brought a new innovation to the whole problem: he wasn't harassing poor innocent booksellers and keeping shy retiring writers from buying their wives birthday presents, no . . . this district attorney had gone to a bindery in Nassau County and confiscated some 23,000 copies of the latest issue of the *Evergreen Review*.

I spoke to Mr. Fred Jordan, managing editor of the *Evergreen Review*, who informed me that Mr. Bentley's article was not only true, it was understated. It seems that the seizure had prompted a series of costly legal actions by the publisher and they still didn't have possession of their 23,000 copies of the magazine. He sounded quite upset. I told him of the situation in Chicago and that perhaps from now on rather than get my friendly neighborhood bookseller in trouble, I would buy my books through the mail from New York City. He sighed and said, "Things are worse here than they are out there."

I made several calls to other people in publishing in New York to get their reaction to the Chicago situation, and they all agreed it was deplorable, but not unusual in the intellectual climate of our country at this time. One publisher said he was thinking of becoming a piano tuner.

Sadly I went to bed, kissing my wife goodnight, and telling her that maybe next year I might be able to buy her a book for her birthday.

During the next few days, while I continued to investigate the situation, Lt. Kernan's name appeared with great frequency in the Chicago press in connection with a raid on a steam bath where alleged homosexuals gather, and how his men had cleverly discovered something every Chicagoan past the age of puberty knows: B-Girls take their customers for all the money they can get.

On June 15th, I attended a meeting of the booksellers, called by Joseph Faulkner of the Main Street Book Store. This book store is located in the promised land for the purveyors of high priced commodities in Chicago. Its neighbors include some of Chicago's most expensive furriers, beauticians, and psychiatrists. The shop itself is the last place one would expect the police of this guilt-ridden city to assemble to oppose the forces of evil. While it is true that in the basement of this establishment paperbacks priced as low as \$1.95 may be purchased, the first floor is devoted entirely to hardback volumes (usually including a liberal selection of those expensive books of collections of lithographs by dead artists which sell for \$20 or more). Upstairs, Mr. Faulkner maintains an art gallery featuring works which are easier to deplore than to describe, as well as some of great beauty and charm.

All in all, Main Street seems to be as dangerous to the community and as worthy of police attention as a kindergarten in a north shore suburb. Therefore, when the meeting was assembled, it was disconcerting to hear Mr. Faulkner's opening remarks:

"The situation in Chicago is the worst in the country.

"The police arrest first and ask questions afterwards.

"We don't even know which books on our shelves might be objectionable to which groups.

"And we don't know who is deciding. It is hard enough for literary experts to define obscenity or good or bad literature."

There were some 35 people in attendance. Among them were representatives of some of the best-known book dealers in Chicago, many of whom look like the kind of people one would expect to find at a PTA meeting, two weary legal warriors who have done valiant service in the city of Chicago fighting for freedom to read — Charles Liebman and Elmer Gertz; the well-tanned Jack Mabley, a columnist for *Chicago's American* (who in print frequently deplores the sale of "smut" but in the trial of *Tropic of Cancer* stated he read "only a couple of books of fiction a year."); Hoke Norris, the southern gentleman who has attempted to civilize the north; Robert Cromie, literary editor of the *Chicago Tribune*; M. W. Newman of the *Chicago Daily News*; a very tired, harassed young attorney from the American Civil Liberties

Union, Joel J. Sprayregen, whose legal agility had caused the Post Office to admit defeat in its efforts to ban *Big Table*, an avant garde magazine published in Chicago; Seymour Bucholtz, also of the ACLU legal staff; a sprinkling of law students, book distributors, and — perhaps — a few police department employees.

THE attitude of the gathering seemed to be nervousness, apprehension, withdrawal, and shock. It was quite apparent that most of the booksellers had never considered themselves as potential residents of criminal institutions in the State of Illinois. After several minutes of strained silence, much like that of a first-night audience at a play that insiders had predicted would only run for a week, the suave Mr. Faulkner suggested various remedies for the situation in which the booksellers found themselves. He seemed to feel that the publishers should be forced to indemnify the booksellers and offered \$500 from his establishment to get such a procedure established. Mr. Gertz, whose brilliant defense of *Tropic of Cancer* had prompted Judge Epstein's historic ruling, made several well-chosen remarks in a soft lisping voice, which seemed to reassure the booksellers that gentility might prevail in the city of hog-butchers. Mr. Gertz was joined by Mr. Liebman who did not seem to share completely Mr. Gertz's optimism. Mr. Sprayregen didn't seem to feel that any one group could change the situation and proposed a rather broad-based association incorporating all those citizens of Chicago who value literacy and their freedom to read. Mr. Sprayregen's remarks shook most of the booksellers out of their reticence, and in well-modulated tones they began giving the details of how members of the Chicago police department in various disguises had attempted to get the booksellers to sell them dirty books. From time to time, one agitated young lady who runs a well-known book store, kept on asking Mr. Faulkner and the group in general who was going to help her if she was arrested that night when she went back to her shop? Several people expressed sympathy for her plight, but no one publicly offered to post bail if her possible arrest became an actuality.

The meeting went on and on and on. Perhaps the most concrete statement was made by Mr. Faulkner who kept on pressing for the formation of some kind of organization of book-

sellers to present their case to the powers that rule Chicago. His attempt at humor, "And I suppose we'll have to get some stationery printed," did nothing to ease the tension.

As we left the meeting, the agitated young lady bookseller was telling of her harassment by members of the Vice Squad who didn't believe her when she said that she hadn't read in its entirety every book in her store. (From comments made at the meeting, booksellers agreed that if the police could get a statement from a bookseller that he had read a book which the police considered objectionable, action could be taken.) Mr. Faulkner was setting the date for the next meeting of an *ad hoc* committee, and the young lady pointed out that by the time this meeting was held, she could well be behind bars. We went home feeling that the young lady's questions had been left unanswered.

Although the booksellers' meeting was almost as depressing as my interviews with the police had been, I decided it was now time to write this report.

After two paragraphs, I received a call from a Chicago lawyer who has to defend a bookseller arrested for selling a copy of *Fanny Hill*. The bookseller faces a one-year prison sentence and/or a \$1,000 fine. The lawyer wanted me to help him secure a university professor who is a specialist in 18th century literature and who would be willing to testify in a Chicago criminal court proceeding that the book *Fanny Hill* is of historic importance.

By the time this article is read, appeals may have been granted by higher courts, which could eliminate the Corporation Counsel and the Chicago police department from their jobs as selectors of what books the citizens of Chicago may read. In the interval, every Chicago bookseller is in daily jeopardy of facing criminal charges because no one seems quite certain which books are obscene.

Ed Sachs has worked for the AP, newspapers, and other media. His fiction and non-fiction have been published in magazines and newspapers. When he is not shopping for "Candy," he is working on a novel.

Would We Accept Your Ad?

We recently disappointed an ad agency by telling them that we have no advertising taboos. This includes cigarette advertising. Anyone who still smokes after all the evidence deserves every cigarette. We feel about cigarettes just as we do about Senator Goldwater or topless bathing suits. Why don't you find out whether your ad is acceptable to our "Advertising Policy Subcommittee In The Interest Of A Pure And Strong America"?

Incidentally, if we employ the criteria of the mass media (computing families, etc.), FOCUS/Midwest will expose 35,000 pair of eyes monthly to the ad you place with us. Since the magazine is so controversial month after month (issues are surreptitiously passed among friends even at Barnes Hospital), you may double or triple this figure. No wonder that there are so many enlightened advertisers who are telling you about their services or products through FOCUS/Midwest.

Our advertisers — in this and past issues — obviously are interested in you. Kindly reciprocate and mention that you have seen their ads in our magazine when you patronize them.

*Allerton House
Art Mart Galleries
The Barn Gallery
Baton Music Company
Bergfried Retreat
Block Book Company
The Book Nook
The Book Shop
Burgdorf Bookseller
Cart Cocktail Lounge
Commercial Insurors
Continental Hotel
Crystal Palace
Diamond Jim's Restaurant
Gilman Gallery
Illinois Democratic Forum
Hamilton Hotel
Henry Regnery
Herman Glick Realtor
International Directory
KBEA Radio
Kerpan's Sauna
Kotobuki Restaurant
Lawrence Art Galleries
Midway Chevrolet Company
The Minority of One Magazine
Moskus' Yacht Club
The Nation Magazine
J. C. Nichols Company
Ozark Airlines
Planters Hotel
Realist Magazine
Runder Photo Studio
Senator Hotel
Sherman House
State House Inn
Three Arts Bookstore
Three Fountains Restaurant*


4th of July

Under
a speech
making
(at the courthouse)
sun
yippee boys
Yankee Doodle
the flag
waving
weather
with their toy
drums
and firecrackers
spoil the games
of little girls
who scoop up
candy
colored
balls & jacks
to run away
in full retreat
flanked by troops
and jeered by
J.
P.
Sousa

Go Read The River

This little red brick
town by the river
never did see
its prettiest girls
run around naked
in hollyhock yards,
or hear a band
that could play good Dixie.
But that sure isn't why
the place went to pot,
why the sun-bleached shades
are all drawn on Elm Street,
or why the slowest trains
thunder by now
to blow thick dust
against the beer signs.

David Pearson Etter is an editor in Chicago. He has published poetry in *Prairie Schooner*, *New Mexico Quarterly*, and this magazine.



BOOKS

The "Chicago" Series / Harry T. Moore

ARTIE and PINK MARSH, Two Short Novels by George Ade (University of Chicago Press, \$3.95, 224 pp.)

THE BOMB by Frank Harris (University of Chicago Press, \$4.95, 332 pp.)

ERIK DORN by Ben Hecht (University of Chicago Press, \$5.95, 409 pp.)

THE idea for this series — publication of fiction by writers associated with Chicago — is far better than the series has yet proven itself to be. In the fullness of time we may expect, under Saul Bellow's editorship, some of the true classics which have come out of the lakeside city which, D. H. Lawrence told Harriet Monroe, is "one of the 'centres' of the earth, more so than New York."

Among the first three of the "Chicago in Fiction" volumes, the one made up of two long stories by George Ade, introduced by James T. Farrell, is easily the best. Here is Chicago in the nineties, looked at with gentle fun: Artie, the office worker in the first story, is an enduring type, and Pink Marsh, the shoeshine boy who becomes a Pullman porter, is no less so. Ade's understanding of people and his ability to put them alive on the page are matched only by his fine ear for dialogue and dialect. Ade's stories are still fresh; as Mr. Farrell says, "his writing has a lasting brightness about it."

The same, regrettably, can't be said of Frank Harris and Ben Hecht. John Dos Passos, one of the novelists called upon to write introductions to this series, does his best for *The Bomb*, chiefly by discussing the man Harris and his interest in Marxism and other phases of radicalism — as everyone knows, *The Bomb* is a story of the Haymarket anarchists. As Mr. Dos Passos notes, Harris wrote in the clear style of Wells and Kipling — the bombast was in the man rather than in his writing — but the synthetic story simply doesn't hold up. It remains a curio out of the past. So too does Ben Hecht's *Erik Dorn*, over which Nelson Algren in his introduction can't quite become enthusiastic.

Erik Dorn, which dates from 1921, is the story of a newspaperman in Chicago at that time; part of the scene is laid in postwar Germany. There are quaintly interesting things about yesterday's Chicago in the book, but mostly it is a slick and superficial piece of work. This series can and will do better, for the idea is a commendable one and the potential is enormous.

Religion Without Competition

James D. Collins

CHURCH UNITY AND CHURCH MISSION, Martin E. Marty. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, \$3.00, 139 pp.)

UNTIL September of 1963, when he became a professor of church history in the University of Chicago, Martin Marty had worked mainly as a Lutheran pastor and vigorous journalist specializing in the ecumenical movement. Although this collection of his reports on that movement is not written in a goodby-to-all-that frame of mind; it is a sort of valedictory to the pre-academic phase of his work. I hope that entering the academy will not mean for him emptying out his sensitivity to current religious thinking or blunting his capacity for the telling phrase.

He makes some sobering points for those who may be inclined to be romantic ecumenists. It should not be forgotten that the Christian churches were pushed into the search for unity, pushed into it by social forces which believers themselves would call "worldly" but which served to prod the churches into a realization of some forgotten truths in their creeds. It was only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that the divisions among the churches took on a scandalous appearance to people outside the communions as well as

The Book Shop

ELIZABETH WRIGHT
102 N. Kirkwood Rd.
St. Louis 22, Mo.
TA 1-7585

The St. Louis
Guidebook
\$1.95
Old St. Louis
Homes \$3.98

inside them. This was due to the inexorable application of all the media of public scrutiny and communication to the churches, especially as they jockeyed among themselves in the mission fields. Brashly competitive conduct could be swept under the rug until about the middle of the last century. Since then almost every such act is reported in full and subjected to the common human standards governing pluralistic living. The world is apparently still serving its providential function. The scandal generated by observing General-Motors-versus-Ford tactics among the missionaries has led everyone to see that the question of church unity is a practical and broadly human concern, not just a matter to be left to the professional ecclesiologists.

BOOK NOOK 46 S. Central
Clayton, PA 7-8139
For personal service
see Viola Davies Graves


BOOKS & PRINTS

Where Marty is particularly vivid is in describing the salutary dislocation in the ecumenical movement during the past five years, due to the participation of Orthodox and Catholic leaders. Although it is an over simplification to say that the former brought with them an ecumenicity in time and the latter an ecumenicity in space, it is evident that they have introduced enough new complexities into the movement to make it take on the dimensions of being a mankind-wide problem. In wrestling with the varieties and modalities of faith and institution within the Christian communities, the ecumenical people are perhaps acquiring their own early education in the unrestricted problem of belief. In its unrestricted form, it concerns the forms of communication and the levels of understanding which still have to be forged out between Christians and men who live by other kinds of belief. This is moving beyond the explicit scope of Marty's book, but his experience of gradual complexification can be extrapolated beyond the field of his

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

—EDMUND BURKE


ANNOUNCING A NEW POLITICAL QUARTERLY



111 West Washington Street — Suite 1437 — Chicago, Illinois 60602

How to tell your Friends from the POPE, or

A guide for Catholic liberals who would like to excommunicate certain Catholics for their "anti-Papal" political opinions.



\$5.95

Politics and Catholic Freedom

by GARRY WILLS

Commonweal editor Daniel Callahan calls this unsettling new book "bittersweet." Virginia Kirkus calls it a "truly genuine service." Library Journal says "This important contribution . . . is recommended . . ."

To keep "open-door" Catholicism from opening in one direction only, read this detailed and witty expose of the covert authoritarianism that has been growing up among American Catholic liberals.

" . . . engages the considerable questions of what is closed and what is open in Catholic dialogue . . . an immense contribution towards a time when Americans can talk as adults."

—MURRAY KEMPTON

" . . . he has performed a useful service in starting what is likely to be a prolonged and, hopefully, a constructive dialogue about the binding force of the social encyclicals . . ."

—MSGR. GEORGE G. HIGGINS

Published by

Regnery

114 W. Illinois St. • Chicago, Ill. 60610

amiliarity. Out of the shocks and recognitions generated in ecumenical Christians working at all levels, there may be generated an awareness of the rest of humanity which will be nonmarginal in aim and intensity.

What Marty regards as the chief lesson of the Christian ecumenical movement to date may eventually apply to all men, without loss of integrity in belief and truth: "Anything Christians might try *will do more justice to truth* than the competitive system they now inhabit." And this is not a unilateral finding, but probably holds for the other forms of human religious belief.

REVIEWERS:

Harry T. Moore is a research professor of English at Southern Illinois University. He is an author and literary critic.

James D. Collins, St. Louis University professor of philosophy, is called by Father John LaFarge "one of the leading philosophical minds of our country." He was the subject of an article in a recent issue of Current Biography and is the author of many books and articles.

LETTERS

Continued from page 4

ers." Why not get subsidized by Moscow and give your lousy magazine away?

F/M: I get the impression that FOCUS's writers are know-it-all wise guys, agnostic perverts, or pinkish screwballs. What a bunch of phonies.

F/M: No to this. Just another left wing propaganda spreader.

F/M: Too many democrates on yours pages. I am republican forever and conservative.

The Church and Birth Control

F/M: Congratulations on the article by Rabbi Ralph Simon titled "The Church and Birth Control."

As founder and co-chairman of Citizens for the Extension of Birth Control Services (CEBCS), I have been deeply involved in the effort to get birth control services into the public health programs of Chicago

and Illinois. Rabbi Simon's article presumes that "much interfaith acrimony and friction" could have been avoided if "those responsible for formulating policy had sought out informed opinion of church officials."

CEBCS would like to take this opportunity to tell Rabbi Simon and his readers that the precise procedure recommended by Rabbi Simon was taken more than two years ago.

In December, 1961 there was a top-level conference specifically devoted to birth control in public health. Leading representatives of the three major religions, plus public officials of welfare, together with Planned Parenthood, all explored the issues thoroughly. Second, there were smaller interfaith discussions also devoted to birth control in public health — its moral and religious aspects. Third, Attorney Ralph Brown and I met with two members of the Catholic clergy to make clear the aims and goals of CEBCS. We explained that family planning would be included as a regular public health service; that there would be no coercion; that the religion of each family would be respected; that the rhythm method would be offered; that the family planning services would be offered by qualified physicians; that medical authorities were in agreement that this is essential to good medical care; and that our sole purpose was to bring to poor families a medical service that is denied them

only because of their inability to pay for private medical care.

Although the dialogs were conducted with great amiability and good will on all sides, no commitment of any sort was made. Every policy pronouncement made by the Catholic Church both during and after the dialogs expressed an uncompromising opposition to any tax-supported family planning program.

The list of those favoring birth control in public health grows steadily. Those opposed remain the same few Catholic groups. On radio or television and when asked for interviews, the opposition is always silent, does not appear, or makes comments that only vaguely relate to the questions asked. The fact is that without responding to public need or medical authority, public officials silently and consistently vote against tax-supported birth control clinics both in connection with Cook County Hospital and the Chicago Board of Health.

I beg to differ with Rabbi Simon. Dialog is not what we need. We need action!

The people of Illinois must demand of public officials that they cease defying medical authority; cease denying medical care to the poor; and immediately implement the recommendations of the 45 organizations favoring family planning services in the public health facilities of Illinois.

Lonny Myers, M.D.
Chicago

**All models in
Chevrolet cars**


Yearly Leasing.

**Expert and Quality
Service.**

MIDWAY
CHEVROLET
COMPANY



SERVICE AND PARTS
6800 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
TELEPHONE FAIRFAX 4-7140
CHICAGO - 37 - ILLINOIS



VOTING RECORDS

Congress

Key to Symbols:

Y—Voting for the Bill
N—Voting against the Bill
A—Absent
AY—Announced for the Bill
AN—Announced against the Bill
PY—Paired for the Bill
PN—Paired against the Bill
HR—House Bill
S—Senate Bill

U. S. SENATE VOTES

(A) **HR 7152.** Civil Rights Act of 1964. Morton (R Ky.) amendment to entitle a defendant to demand a trial by jury on a criminal contempt charge arising under any section of the Act except Title I, covering voting rights; the amendment limited maximum sentence for contempt to six months in prison and a \$1,000 fine. Agreed to 51-48; R 20-13; D 31-35 (ND 9-34; SD 22-1), June 9, 1964. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(B) **HR 7152.** Adoption of the Mansfield (D Mont.)-Dirksen (R Ill.) substitute for the House-passed bill. The major differences were that the substitute placed more specific authority in local agencies to work out problems of discrimination in public accommodations and employment; authorized the Attorney General to sue only against patterns or practices of discrimination in these fields, and set out procedures for individuals to sue on their own behalf; it contained the Morton (R Ky.) jury trial amendment and other amendments accepted by the Senate. Adopted 76-18; R 30-0; D 46-18 (ND 42-0; SD 4-18), June 17, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(C) **HR 7152.** Civil Rights Act of 1964. Adoption of the amended Mansfield (D. Mont.)-Dirksen (R Ill.) substitute for the House-passed bill. Agreed to 76-18; R 30-0; D 46-18 (ND 42-0; SD 4-18), June 17, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(D) **HR 7152.** Passage of the Civil Rights Act, covering voting rights, equal access to public accommodations, desegregation of public facilities, public school desegregation, extension of the Civil Rights Commission, nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs, equal employment opportunity, gathering of registration and voting statistics by race, intervention by the Attorney General in pending civil rights cases, review of court orders remanding a case to state courts, establishment of a Community Relations Service, and jury trials under the Act. Passed 73-27; R 27-6; D 46-21 (ND 43-1; SD 3-20), June 19, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(E) **S 6.** Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Passage of the bill, authorizing federal matching grants to states and localities totaling \$375 million over three years as the "first installment" of a program to improve urban mass transportation service. Passed 47-36; R 6-20; D 41-16 (ND 31-6; SD 10-10), June 30, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(F) **HR 11049.** Passage of the bill raising the salaries of approximately 1.7 million federal career employees and of federal executives, judges and members of Congress by \$556.8 million. Passed 58-21; R 15-9; D 43-12 (ND 35-3; SD 8-9), July 2, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

U. S. SENATE	A	B	C	D	E	F
Dirksen (R., Ill.)	N	Y	Y	Y	PN	Y
Douglass (D., Ill.)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Long (D., Mo.)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Symington (D., Mo.)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

U. S. HOUSE VOTES

(A) **HR 11380.** The Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. Adair (R Ind.) motion to recommit the bill with instructions to reduce the fiscal 1965 authorization for development loans by \$750,000,000 and the President's contingency fund by \$50,000,000. Rejected 193-211; R 148-22; D 45-189 (ND 6-135; SD 39-54), June 10, 1964. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(B) **HR 11380.** Passage of the bill authorizing \$2.041 billion on new foreign aid appropriations for fiscal 1965. Passed 230-175; R 56-115; D 174-60 (ND 133-8; SD 41-52), June 10, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(C) **HR 11049.** Raise the salaries of approximately 1.7 million federal career employees and of federal executives, judges and members of Congress. Passed 243-157; R 59-111; D 184-46 (ND 131-10; SD 53-36), June 11, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the position of President Johnson.

(D) **HR 3881.** Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Passage of the bill authorizing federal matching grants to states and localities totaling \$375 million over three years as the "first installment" of a program to improve urban mass transportation service. Passed 212-189; R 39-128; D 173-61 (ND 137-4; SD 36-57), June 25, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(E) **HR 11812.** Rhodes (R Ariz.) motion to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce economic aid funds by \$247.8 million as recommended by Rep. Passman (D La.), chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Rejected 198-208; R 143-23; D 55-185 (ND 8-135; SD 47-50), July 1, 1964. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(F) **HR 11812.** Passage of the bill appropriating \$3,316,572,400 for foreign assistance and \$422,677,000 for related programs. Passed 231-174; R 55-111; D 176-63 (ND 133-9; SD 43-54), July 1, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

(G) **HR 7152.** Civil Rights Act of 1964. Adoption of a resolution (H Res 789) providing for House approval of the bill as amended by the Senate, thus clearing it for the President to sign into law. Resolution adopted 289-126; R 136-35; D 153-91 (ND 141-3; SD 12-88), July 2, 1964. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

U. S. HOUSE

ILLINOIS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
21 Gray (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
24 Price (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
23 Shipley (D)	PY	PN	A	Y	Y	N	Y
16 Anderson (R)	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
17 Arends (R)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
20 Findley (R)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
14 Hoffman (R)	A	N	Y	A	A	PN	Y
12 McClory (R)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
19 McLoskey (R)	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
18 Michel (R)	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
15 Reid (R)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
22 Springer (R)	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y

CHICAGO

1 Dawson (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
9 Finnegan (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
5 Kluczynski (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
7 Libonati (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
3 Murphy (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
6 O'Brien (D)							
2 O'Hara (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
11 Pucinski (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
8 Rostenkowski (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
10 Collier (R)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Derwinski (R)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
13 Kumsfeld (R)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y

MISSOURI

5 Bolling (D)	A	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
9 Cannon (D)							
6 Hull (D)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
8 Ichord (D)	Y	N	N	A	Y	N	N
10 Jones (D)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
1 Karsten (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
4 Randall (D)	N	N	PN	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Sullivan (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
2 Curtis (R)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 Hall (R)	Y	N	PN	N	Y	N	N

COMING SOON!

Big cities as a whole are too big to provide a feeling of belonging for their residents. The city is nameless. But within big cities, writes JERRY VOORHIS in the coming issue, there can develop true neighborhoods — segments of the city where, due to a variety of circumstances, people are able to find the contentment which comes from the sense of belonging.

Voorhis tells of THE COOPERATIVE COMMUNITIES in Chicago (The Hyde Park Cooperative Society), in St. Louis (The Labor Health Institute), and in Kansas City (The Consumers Cooperative Association). Mutual aid, declares the author, has always been a civilizing force in the life of man.

It is a story of hope, don't miss it.

And many other articles and exposes dealing with the hard political, social, and cultural issues in your city and state.

For New Subscribers ONLY!

3 issues for only **\$1.00**

If Payment Enclosed

Please enter an Introductory Subscription

Name

Street

City State Zip ..

Occupation

FOCUS/Midwest

P.O.B. 3086 - St. Louis 30, Mo.